The Nation

FOUNDED 1865

Vol. CXXXVII NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 16, 1933 No. 3554

Contents

EDITORIAL PARAGRAPHS 169
EDITORIALS:
The Death Penalty for Kidnapping 172
The Assault on the Schoolhouse 173
Mortgage Relief 173
Editors as Teachers 174
ISSUES AND MEN. WHY DO PUBLIC MEN RATIONALIZE? By Oswald Garrison Villard 175
MINE WAR IN PENNSYLVANIA. By Daniel Allen 176
LABOR RACKETEERING. By Harold Seidman 177
THE NRA SPEEDS UP. By Paul Y. Anderson 181
THE TEACHER FACES THE DEPRESSION. By Eunice Langdon . 182
LIBERIA IN SHACKLES. By Mauritz A. Hallgren 185
IN THE DRIFTWAY. By the Drifter 188
CORRESPONDENCE 189
BOOKS AND FILMS:
Flight of Fish. By Kay Boyle 190
Rio Grande. By Maxwell Anderson 190
Jews and Minority Rights. By Marvin Lowenthal 191
World Without End. By Dorothy Van Doren 191
Both Ends of the Microscope. By Grace Adams 192
Down Under. By C. Hartley Grattan 193
Health Can Be Bought. By David Beres 193
Counter-Revolution in Russia. By Mauritz A. Hallgren . . . 194
The Frontier of Today. By Ruth Benedict 194
Shorter Notices 195
Films: American Exhibit. By William Troy 196
CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS ISSUE 196

BOARD OF EDITORS

ERNEST GRUENING FREDA KIRCHWEY
HENRY HAZLITT JOSEPH WOOD KRUTCH

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

MARGARET MARSHALL MAURITZ A. HALLGREN

OSWALD GARRISON VILLARD
CONTRIBUTING EDITOR

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: Five dollars per annum postpaid in the United States; to Canada, $5.50; and to other foreign countries, $6.00.

THE NATION, No. 20 Vesey Street, New York City. Cable Address: NATION, New York. Muriel C. Gray, Advertising Manager. British Agent, Gertrude M. Cross, 23 Brunswick Square, London W. C. 1, England.

THE DEFINITE STAND of the Administration against strikes, although expected, has come sooner than most persons had thought likely. It is put forward by Mr. Roosevelt as an "appeal" rather than as an order, and although eventually there is sure to be strong pressure to insure compliance with it, the fact remains that labor organizations are not required to accept the mediation of the new National Board of Arbitration, nor is there any authority in existing law for exercising compulsion upon them. The government's legal powers under the National Recovery Act are much greater over the employer than over the employee. Under a licensing system the former may be directed almost at will, but we believe that labor will and should use its discretion in accepting the services of the new board, never losing sight of its right to strike as a final recourse. It is true that with working hours and minimum wages settled by codes there will be less reason for strikes and less public sympathy with strikers than otherwise, but the workers will still be compelled to fight for wage scales above the minimums and will have to demand revision of the latter from time to time if prices rise according to expectations. Perhaps the greatest objection to the government's precipitance in trying to head off strikes by a mediation board is that it ought first to have clarified unmistakably its intention to support the right of labor to maintain its own organizations and treat with employers through them. Until the government definitely rejects company unions as representatives of labor, labor will and should refuse to sheath its one effective weapon—the strike.

THIS FAILURE of the Administration to rule against company unions was seized upon by Mary Van Kleeck in making an early and effective protest against the National Board of Arbitration. Miss Van Kleeck, who is the director of industrial study for the Russell Sage Foundation, had accepted membership on the Federal Advisory Board of the United States Employment Service, but sent her resignation to Secretary Perkins upon the appointment of the mediation board. Investigation and experience, said Miss Van Kleeck, "have led me to the conclusion that only genuine collective bargaining through trade unions, with the right to strike preserved and not discouraged, can insure the self-government in industry necessary to stabilize employment and raise wages." Miss Van Kleeck voiced justifiable objection also to the personnel of the mediation board. It is certainly unfortunate that two of the three employer members, Walter C. Teagle and Gerard Swope, should be known opponents of labor organization. With the exception of Leo Wolman, the labor members are no better. It was perhaps inevitable that William Green should be chosen, since he is the head of the American Federation of Labor, but there was no excuse for including John L. Lewis, president of the United Mine Workers. Mr. Lewis is discredited with a large proportion of his own organization, and his loyalty to labor is so widely doubted that he will inspire no confidence whatever among workers as a dependable representative of their interests. The revealing test of the Administration's attitude toward labor will come in the steel and coal codes. Their terms will have more to do with precipitating or preventing strikes than the National Board of Arbitration.

FRANCES PERKINS'S VISIT to the steel mills was played up by the daily press for the excellent news it was, but the story of how she was denied her constitutional rights in the town of Homestead, Pennsylvania, was either ignored or reported obscurely. In the steel country Miss Perkins learned how hot a blast furnace can be. She also learned about something else that steel workers have to put up with. In Homestead the Secretary of Labor of the United States announced that she would hold a question hour in the Town Hall at which she would be glad to hear any comment on the steel code by any worker. But when President E. P. Cush of the Steel and Metal Workers Industrial Union tried to attend the meeting, he was ordered away by the Homestead police. A reporter from the Federated Press was also barred. Miss Perkins was informed of the discrimination and repeated that anyone who wished to come should be admitted. Again Mr. Cush was barred by the police. Miss Perkins was beginning to be annoyed. Deserting the Town Hall, she announced that she would

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

adjourn the meeting to a nearby park. But here again she met with difficulties; the mayor of the town informed her that she could not hold a meeting in the public park! The tale ends with Miss Perkins holding her meeting in the United States Post Office, having told the Homestead police to stay on their own territory outside the federal precincts. It should be added that once inside, Mr. Cush justified the worst fears of the police and the mayor. He asked for a thirty-hour week, unemployment insurance at company and government cost, and a minimum wage of 66 2/3 cents an hour.

THE labor racketeer is an American phenomenon, the product of our national desire for easy money and a ruthless individualism which has made of social conscience in this country the sickly plant it is. On another page of this issue we print an account of the methods by which corrupt labor leaders have used trade-union organizations for their own enrichment, sold out the rank and file to employers and politicians, and yet been able to intrench themselves so securely as to be removable only by court action and then only rarely. At the moment, American labor faces a crisis whose importance cannot be exaggerated. On the strength of the cohesion of its own ranks and the integrity of its leadership and aims, depends in part the answer to the question whether labor is to be the slave of an industrial fascism or the strong partner in an industrial democracy. The labor racketeer, though he is by no means typical of American labor leadership, is the epitome of the forces which have made the labor movement ineffectual in this country. It has been undemocratic; it has assumed no social responsibility; it has sought to perpetuate its own special set-up without regard to the needs of the great mass of workers who have looked in vain for disinterested leadership. The rank and file of labor must take matters into its own hands if it is to attain a decent way of life. The coal miners in Pennsylvania seem to have learned this lesson, but the tragic side of their situation is that while they have discovered that John L. Lewis is generally to be found on the same side of the fence as their employers, they are only now developing leaders of their own.

OF all the government's attempts to economize at the expense of tried and trusted civil servants, the dropping of a number of young, trained consuls and other foreign-service officers is especially depressing. For years the effort was made to establish a permanent diplomatic corps; at last Congress agreed, and it was announced that permanent careers were available for young men who could pass the tests set by the government. If they did, and their conduct in the service was good, they were assured of employment, steady promotion, and pensions on retirement, toward which they made contributions out of their pay. All went well until the present Administration came in, and then the axe fell ruthlessly. A number of these young officials stationed abroad were dismissed and turned adrift without any promise of reinstatement if times should improve, to find jobs where there were no jobs after having prepared themselves for a special career. If private employers behaved thus, we know how we should feel about such a violation of obligation. This case is, of course, no worse than the dismissal of thousands of other civil-service employees, but it is a shining example of false economy.

GANDHI HAS GONE BACK to prison. Amid all the screaming newspaper headlines of arriving and departing aviators, of strikes and riots, of industrial codes, of murder clues, of parleys and conferences and pacts, this announcement alone seems to be of permanent consequence. Rather than promise not to participate further in civil disobedience and so remain free on parole, the Mahatma has accepted a sentence of a year in jail, from which not improbably he will never emerge alive. We talk about this as the age of the machine and an era in which only organization can accomplish results. Yet where else is there a spectacle of power faintly comparable to that of this frail body opposing its lone personality, peaceably yet effectively, against the united land, sea, and air forces of the British Empire? Without any of the adjuncts which we regard as essential to power—without fortune, or family, or office, or armed supporters—this humble Indian is known and reverenced all over the world because almost alone among the so-called great of the day there is not a shadow of a doubt of his utter unselfishness, of his complete devotion to his cause. We may or may not believe in Gandhi's objectives, but unless all of man's supposed progress upward from the cave is fictitious, unless the idea that reason is destined to prevail over brute force is false, then the methods and spirit of the Mahatma are bound to survive his weak and ungainly body and become an increasing power on the earth.

THE WHIRLIGIG OF TIME has been bringing changes to the Caribbean republics as well as to other parts of the world. As this issue of *The Nation* went to press the abdication, or ousting, of President Machado of Cuba appeared imminent, bringing to an end his unhappy administration of tyranny, repression, and corruption. Sumner Welles, the American Ambassador, has been working guardedly for such a solution since his arrival in Havana, but events seem to have outfooted the pace of his diplomacy. In the neighboring republic of Haiti an agreement has been reached between our minister and the insular government by which October 1 of next year has been set for the complete withdrawal of American marines. This will liquidate the unjustifiable occupation of Latin American soil authorized by Wilson, Harding, and Coolidge, but disapproved by Hoover and Roosevelt. The United States still holds a financial string to Haiti. This should be loosed next and Americans given to understand that they must take the same chances in investments abroad as they run at home.

MATHILDE VAERTING has been dismissed by the German government from the staff of the University of Jena where she has served since 1923 as professor of education. Friends who are seeking funds in order to make possible the continuation of Dr. Vaerting's work in some other country have issued a statement asserting that her dismissal was neither for political reasons nor for reasons of race; she is not a member of any party nor is she a Jew. The statement does not hazard a guess as to the actual cause of the government's action, but it is easy to do so even at this distance. Dr. Vaerting is famous the world over as a feminist. Although her activities have been educational rather than political or propagandist, she has expressed in many books and articles her belief in the equality of the sexes. She maintains that the political dominance of men is a socio-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

logical rather than a biological factor—a dominance comparable to the dominance at various periods of various races and types of culture and subject, like them, to evolutionary or revolutionary change. She believes that the claims of the dominant group, be it class, or race, or sex, to inherent superiorities can be controverted by an impartial examination of the records of history. It is not hard to see how antipathetic the ideas of this educator must be to the present dominant group in Germany. Her teaching is a direct challenge to their basic claims—racial and national superiority, political autocracy, and, finally, the desirability of relegating women to political subservience and the primary function of breeding new Nazis. Apart from her views the very presence of this distinguished woman on the faculty of a great German university must have been distressing to the government. Her dismissal is the most striking overt act so far committed in the Nazi war against the freedom of women.

THE PEOPLE of New York City are fortunate in the chance to vote for Fiorello H. La Guardia for Mayor. If they elect him, they will secure more than "reform." They will be assured of a militant and enlightened effort to establish for the metropolis the equivalent of the New Deal which the progressives in Washington are earnestly seeking for the nation. Nor can national recovery percolate to the people of New York if it is largely nullified by local misgovernment. La Guardia can be elected. Not for twenty years has Tammany been so much on the defensive, so vulnerable. More than ever is it clear that the alternative between a Tammany victory and a La Guardia victory is bankruptcy or solvency for the city, corrupt or honest government. But that is stating the lowest common denominator of the issue. Fusion headed by La Guardia will demonstrate how much enlightened leadership and policy can achieve. It should mean not merely carrying on the numerous vital municipal services with an effectiveness previously unknown, but the creation of a new type of planned urban society, with housing, school, and playground facilities hitherto undreamed of, and other manifestations of how a socially minded administration may transform the character of the dwelling place of six million people. The prenomination skirmishing and the collapse of the early opposition to La Guardia have enormously strengthened him. It now remains to be seen whether the people of New York will rise to their great opportunity not merely in the minimum performance of their elementary duty of registering and voting—which so many thousands who should know better neglect—but in taking an active part in the campaign.

WHETHER it was a sincere desire for self-reform, the fear of action by Congress when it meets in December if self-reform was not initiated, or the result of a direct warning from the Administration which led the Stock Exchange to adopt its recent rulings to control speculation, we need not inquire too curiously. In any case the reforms must be welcomed as steps in the right direction. The exchange has ruled that in future customers having accounts of less than $5,000 must have minimum margins of 50 per cent, while accounts over $5,000 must have margins of 30 per cent. No margin is to be granted on stocks selling below $5 a share or bonds selling at less than 10 per cent of their face value. Weekly reports are demanded from members of all pools and syndicates, giving the number of shares involved and including copies of any written agreements. Various rulings are adopted through which it is hoped to reduce the high-pressure methods of "customers' men" in soliciting orders. These should be merely first steps toward more thoroughgoing reforms. The functions of speculation are to provide a constant flow of new capital funds for industry and a quick and fluid market for the purchase and sale of securities. These functions are currently performed at a disproportionate social cost. The volume and violence of speculation should be curbed. The next step, certainly, should be a raising of the margin requirements of the larger accounts to 50 per cent; and it may be well for the exchange to ask itself whether such devices as the so-called "stop-loss order," which always aggravates fluctuations, should not be prohibited.

WE COMMENTED last week on the backward step of the Wisconsin Legislature in voting to make military training in the State university compulsory instead of optional, and expressed the hope that Governor Schemedeman would veto the measure. We are glad to say that he has vetoed it.

OF ERUDITION, unlike most other forms of wealth amassed through effort, it is unfortunately true that it can be taken by its owner to the grave. The knowledge of the scholar, like the voice of the singer, the gesture of the actor, or the technique of the musical performer, is one of those possessions which the world enjoys only so long as it gives breath to the possessor. The death of a scholar in any field is therefore a very real and tangible loss to the world. And this loss is even greater when the particular field happens to be one to which too few have devoted themselves, in which the ground-work has scarcely been laid and authorities are rare. Just such a loss is represented in the recent death in New York, at the age of thirty-five, of Harry Alan Potamkin, who was perhaps more erudite in his particular field than anyone in the country. Although not well known to the great public which goes to the films, Potamkin revealed in his reviews and articles a familiarity with the motion-picture field, past and present, so complete as to inspire the same implicit confidence in his authority as a Bernard Berenson writing on Florentine painting or a T. S. Eliot writing on Elizabethan poetry. As a film correspondent in Europe for several years and as a member of the National Board of Review, Potamkin had opportunities of seeing more pictures, and a greater variety of them, than is the lot of very many people interested in the field anywhere in the world. The result was that he was in a position, just before his death, of becoming the first historian of the new art—its stumbling beginnings, transitions, experiments, and triumphs. In his essays on Pabst, Clair, Pudovkin, and Eisenstein, published during the last year, he showed an equipment for that task at least as complete as that of any Ph.D. in a university about to prepare a thesis in some more traditional field of learning. As a critic, it is true, he might have continued to suffer from what many people believed to be a too insistent application of the social point of view, as well as from his highly abstract and idiosyncratic style. But what distinguished his writing was the wealth of information it revealed in a field in which not many are yet well informed—and this is what makes it seem so irreplaceable.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Death Penalty for Kidnapping

IN recent years kidnapping has been attracting unusual attention. The number of kidnappings perpetrated with a view to ransom seems to have increased considerably, and the publicity accorded to them has increased tremendously. The two circumstances have interacted. The increase in kidnappings has led the press to put extraordinary emphasis on such crimes, while this very emphasis has been the direct suggestion to many persons to attempt this method of getting money. A public demand to "do something about it" has been fanned by the newspapers, and as usual in such situations a good deal of hysteria and unwisdom has resulted. The counsel easiest to give, and therefore the most generally given, has been to stiffen the penalties for kidnapping. A thoughtless and uninformed campaign has been undertaken by a good many newspapers to make kidnapping an offense punishable by death. Several States have already taken such action. In Missouri one of the participants in the kidnapping of Mary McElroy is actually under sentence of death. In California recently Governor Rolph signed an act making kidnapping punishable by death, and almost at the same time Governor Lehman recommended to the Legislature of New York that it pass a law making possible a similar penalty.

Although this demand for a pound of flesh, this reversion to violence as a preventive of crime, is the easiest answer to the problem, it is, in the light of all experience, not only sure to be ineffective but certain to have disastrous consequences on our attitude toward and treatment of the entire subject of crime and the criminal. The all too prevalent belief that capital punishment lessens crime has little support either in history or in psychology. In the days when even in the most enlightened countries men and women were executed, frequently with torture, for a large number of offenses, such severity seems to have had no observable effect in checking crime. Rather than inspiring fear and horror in the hearts of potential criminals, it seared them with indifference and steeped them in contempt for human life—their own or another's. Relaxation in the severity and brutality of punishment has gone hand in hand with a reduction in crimes of violence. Perhaps it may be argued that a reduction in crime preceded a lessening in the brutality of punishment rather than the other way around. Probably each influence has reacted on the other, but nothing seems better established in psychology than that violence begets violence and respect for life on the part of the community engenders the same feeling on the part of the individual.

Our entire attitude toward crime has undergone profound modifications in recent years. Punishment as an act of vengeance no longer has any standing in civilized communities. The object is prevention and reform, and prevention is retarded, not furthered, by legalized butchery. So long as the state, acting in cold blood, destroys human life, it cannot expect its citizens to attain to high practices in the treatment of their fellows. All students of criminal psychology are united now in the belief that the criminal mind is abnormal and that crime should be treated as a disease as surely as insanity. The offender should be put where he can no longer offend, cured if possible, but in no circumstances made the victim of legalized official violence, which can have no other effect than to make violence tolerable in the community.

Up to a few years ago the world was making good progress toward the abolition of capital punishment. Civilized nations had abolished it almost entirely except for murder, and a number of the most enlightened had done away with it altogether. In this country the movement had made such headway as to include a sixth of our States. It would be a tragedy if public hysteria, stimulated by thoughtless newspapers and clap-trap politicians, should set an enlightened movement back through an opportunist effort to deal with kidnapping.

Without question kidnapping is a difficult crime to contend with, because commonly no help can be had from the relatives of the victim, who are naturally more anxious to get their loved one back than to make him a possible victim in the interest of public justice. Last year a law was passed by Congress making kidnapping which involves interstate conspiracy or transportation of the victim a federal crime. Since then federal agents have assisted in the effort to unravel most of the important cases of kidnapping and only two such have gone unsolved.

Although the intervention of the federal government in kidnapping cases is probably a step in the right direction, it is not without considerable dangers. One of them is a tendency to permit, or encourage, the national government to intrude increasingly into the prosecution of crime, a field hitherto reserved almost exclusively to the States. There is some agitation at the moment, indeed, for the development of a kind of super police force by the national government—an American Scotland Yard. Under our Constitution federal police authority is exceedingly limited in scope, existing chiefly in connection with smuggling, counterfeiting, robbing the mails, violations of the income-tax, internal-revenue, narcotic, and prohibition laws, and the like. To change our Constitution so as to give the federal government wide control of crime would probably be repugnant to the instincts of a citizenry which has been accustomed to a more flexible and localized system. On the other hand, to allow the federal government to superimpose an illegal or extra legal police force upon our existing State authorities would be highly dangerous. We saw something of the possibilities of such action when A. Mitchell Palmer was at the head of the Department of Justice during the World War. Whereas we are in acute need of better State and municipal police, an enlargement of the federal field would inevitably tend to weaken the local services. In recent years the Bureau of Identification of the Department of Justice has done excellent work in the way of collecting and distributing criminal records and acting as a clearing house of information useful to State and municipal police. Such work is capable of further expansion with promise of good results, but the recent conference of State Governors was well advised in refusing to indorse the project of a super police directed by the United States Government.

It is safe to say that the most effective way to reduce kidnappings is to apprehend a high proportion of the culprits,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

thus taking the profit out of the crime. So far as kidnapping for ransom is concerned—and that is the kind that is giving trouble nowadays—the crime will stop automatically the moment that it begins to result generally in financial failure, no matter whether the punishment provided is great or small. On the other hand, no punishment however severe, holds much terror if the perpetrator knows that the chance that he will be caught is slight. It is a question if fear of punishment ever weighs much in the mind of a prospective criminal anyhow. Either he believes that his lucky star is going to save him from capture and conviction, or else he envisages the future with indifference and a refusal to consider in any reasoning way the possibilities of his contemplated action.

The Assault on the Schoolhouse

THE plight of the teacher is discussed elsewhere in this issue in one of a series of articles dealing with the effect of the depression on the various professions. Even since this article was put into type, the distress of the school teacher—and of the college teacher, which will be treated next week—has become markedly aggravated. Chicago, flaunting its Century of Progress exhibition along the waterfront, has, through its political Board of Education, leveled the most destructive blow at primary and secondary education in the annals of any American city. It has voted to abolish all junior high schools, the Crane Junior College, swimming pools, the vocational guidance bureau, orchestral music, physical education in elementary schools, manual training and household arts in all elementary schools, and has dismissed 1,000 teachers.

The leading support for this campaign comes from the Chicago *Tribune,* long the most jingoistic, sinister force in the life of Chicago. Bellowing at all times for defense against every fancied foreign enemy and against "reds"—in which category it includes the most high-minded citizens who do not share the *Tribune's* reactionary views—it was complacent during the assaults against life, law, and order from the underworld gangsterism for which its own police reporter was the go-between. It was complacent too toward the Insulls, and the corruption which they fostered in the Mid-Western metropolis. Gangsters and banksters have seldom drawn the fire of the "World's Greatest Newspaper," but the hounded and harried school teachers, and that most truly American institution, that potential bulwark against the tyrannies of the right and left, the schoolhouse—these have been the objects of the *Tribune's* vicious attack.

Against this obscurantism, a higher type of Americanism has sought expression through the Chicago *Daily News* and the Hearst papers, and through mass meetings. Robert Maynard Hutchins, president of the University of Chicago, has publicly demanded that the school board be driven out. Jane Addams and scores of other enlightened citizens have protested with utmost vigor against the closing of Crane Junior College with its 3,500 students—girls and boys who cannot afford the tuition fees of other institutions—and against the elimination of other indispensable adjuncts of modern education which the *Tribune* denounces as "frills and furbelows."

It should be noted further that it is under the leadership of Silas Strawn, Chicago corporation lawyer, that the United States Chamber of Commerce and other "business" groups, have with the declared objective of reducing taxation been conducting a campaign against our public educational system. Their recommendations include the reduction of high-school and elementary-school curricula by one year each, the shortening of the school year by a month, the shortening of the school day by one hour, the discontinuance of evening classes and kindergartens, increase in the size of classes (as if they were not already far too large), lengthening of teachers' hours, further reduction in teachers' salaries, and numerous other drastic "economies."

Of all the disastrous consequences of the depression, this assault on the coming generation's chance to secure a modicum of education is the most damnable. These would-be tax-slackers are public enemies who, while patrioteering at every opportunity, are themselves as unpatriotic a brood as exist in our society. They should be scourged from their positions of authority and influence by a wrathful public opinion, and education should not only be restored to its former place, but lifted to a new level of efficiency, dignity, and freedom.

Mortgage Relief

GOVERNOR LEHMAN'S special message to the New York legislature on mortgage relief advocated measures most of which are desirable as far as they go. His chief recommendation was the enactment of a law establishing a moratorium on foreclosure proceedings for a period ending May 1, 1934, providing that tax payments and mortgage-interest payments are made in the meanwhile and that there is a default only on account of principal. The Governor also asked for a limitation on the amount of any deficiency judgment against defaulting mortgagors, the limitation being determined in accordance with a "fair value" of the properties involved as determined by a court. He recommended in addition that securities of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation be made legal investments for banks and insurance companies and for trust funds, and that banks, insurance companies, and trustees be authorized to exchange mortgages in their possession for bonds of the corporation.

As Henry Goldey pointed out in our issue of last week, the bonds of this corporation are so dubious in some respects that it is doubtful whether holders of mortgages more than covered by the value of the property would prefer to accept them rather than foreclose, even if granted the legal power to acquire them. Again, it may be asked—in view of the present great desire of all holders of mortgages "to get out from under" at the earliest opportunity, because of the general decline in real-estate values—whether a moratorium on principal payments of eight or nine months would be long enough to do a great deal of good. Governor Lehman, it is true, recommends that the moratorium run "at least" till May 1, 1934, and remarks that before the end of that time the legislature may determine whether a continuation of the moratorium is necessary and advisable. But as conditions in the real-estate field seem unlikely to change radically for the better in a mere nine months, it would add greatly to the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

present peace of mind of home owners if the moratorium were immediately made to run until May 1, 1935, or at least until January 1 of that year. This extension could be granted at very little risk, particularly as it would merely cover the repayment of principal and would not affect the income of mortgages from interest payments.

Finally, one may question the Governor's conclusion that a moratorium on interest payments themselves could only be harmful. Certainly this argument would apply against a moratorium permitting a general and total suspension of interest payments, but not against one permitting home owners in certain circumstances to pay somewhat less than the full interest due—especially as such a moratorium would not relieve them of their obligation to remit the unpaid balance at the end of the partial moratorium period.

Editors As Teachers

CHESTER S. LORD was his name, but "Boss" Lord was what they called him in the office of the New York *Sun* where he was for thirty-three years managing editor, and his men adored him. Although he was a master craftsman, when the news of his death came, the survivors among his disciples thought, we are sure, far more of the man, their friend and inspirer, than of his skill in the technique of his profession. One of them, long dead, once wrote of him that he was "calm, dispassionate, without the slightest atom of impulse, as wise as a serpent, as gentle as a dove," and that in all his years of authority he was never known "to utter an unkind word to any man on the paper, no matter how humble his station." If it seems strange to some that it should be necessary to say that a New York managing editor was both that and a gentleman, be it remembered that Mr. Lord labored in the days when many newspaper offices prided themselves on their utterly conscienceless and hard-boiled character and were not considered the real thing unless they were desolate, dirty, and generally devoid of manners and morals, with editors who considered cursing and rowdyism a necessary part of their trade.

But Mr. Lord was far more than a kindly newspaper executive. He had a rare gift for recognizing other men's talents and bringing out the best that was in them. He taught them a love of their work and of its tools. He nurtured in them a great pride in the daily which they helped to make, and together they created a newspaper which beyond question was the best written, the most brilliantly edited, and the livest news-sheet in its palmy days. Its staff was the envy of many competitors, who constantly sought to draw away from it "men trained by Lord." In most newspaper offices its arrival was more eagerly awaited than that of any other journal. Its stories were imitated, copied, stolen, "lifted." There was endless enjoyment of its sarcasm, its frequent bitterness, its all-pervading cynicism, its brilliance, its mastery of style, its extraordinarily intelligent and accurate reporting—when it wanted to be accurate. But the truth must also be told that it was anything but an ideal newspaper. It could be guilty of the most vindictive vendettas, the most flagrant misrepresentations. It stabbed men and women freely and then knew how to turn the dagger in their wounds in the most diabolical way.

The *Sun* of Charles A. Dana never was actuated by principle. It scoffed at many a verity, as it defied the moralities. It made vice attractive, as was often said, and naturally did little to advance its times or to improve the standards of its day. That it punctured humbugs and exposed many a bogus pretension is true, and that must be remembered to its credit. But when it was obsessed by a mortal antipathy toward any individual there was no length to which it would not go. It then seemed impossible that there could be even one man upon its staff in whom the milk of human kindness had not curdled. For these characteristics the credit and discredit belong, of course, to Charles A. Dana. But Chester S. Lord was not one to dissociate himself from his chief. However much the daily whose make-up he directed might appear to be in complete contrast to those high traits of character for which he was beloved by all who knew him well, Mr. Lord exalted his association with Mr. Dana, recalling with pride that "for seventeen years of my thirty-three years as managing editor I was Dana's right-hand man."

Of the powerful newspaper these men directed there is today not a trace. It cannot, however, be said that its lack of conscience and of morals killed it, for there is likewise nothing but tradition left of dailies whose standards were far superior. But we would not stress the question today of the relation of newspaper morality to longevity. It is a pleasanter task to point out the great opportunities for great teachers within newspaper offices profoundly to affect the growth and direct the education of the younger men who come under their influence. Mr. Lord achieved wonders in a bad school. In others such as the *Manchester Guardian* and, on this side of the Atlantic, the Springfield *Republican* and the Boston *Herald*—of earlier days—men were profoundly molded, and not merely as brilliant writers and technicians, by the great personalities at the head of the staff.

Not even the professor in his class room has such opportunities as has an editor to form and develop the men around him. That is not merely due to the close daily association year in and year out; the making of a great journal is a daily grappling with life, with every phase of the world's activity, with all its triumphs and all its sorrows and disasters. It is a joint enterprise for all concerned, in which few can take part, even as office boys, without a sense of comradeship in adventure. If then there are leaders in the shop, whether with or without scruple, it is a fact that they have extraordinary chances to rally to themselves those about them. There is a joint sense of being on the firing-line, even one of being on the defensive as well as the offensive, since the newspaper, whenever it leaves the press, is subject to the critical barrage of its readers. This again makes for the closest ties among its workers as well as affording endless opportunities for the best of generalship.

It is pleasant to record that in the case of Mr. Lord his obituaries have stressed the kindly human side; not the evil that he helped to do has lived after him but the good. So in England men mourn today C. P. Scott and Henry W. Massingham, whose journalistic standards were so high and beyond reproach that men consider it their proudest boast to say that they worked for Scott's "M. G." and "H. W. M.'s *Nation*." Fortunately, the list of similar American editors who have placed conscience and courage above success is not small.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Issues and Men

Why Do Public Men Rationalize?

I AM moved to ask this question by the extraordinary expression of opinions by President Roosevelt and Prime Minister MacDonald apropos the end of the World Economic Conference. MacDonald would not only not admit failure, he declared that the conference was not even adjourned; it had merely ended one session without specifying when it would meet again! As for our President, he had not a doubt. "I do not regard the economic conference as a failure," he telegraphed to London. "Results are not always measured in terms of formal agreements," he also said. "They can come equally from a free presentation of each nation's difficulties and each nation's methods to meet its individual needs." In other words, he assured the world that those wasted weeks, which his own acts doomed to futility, were really not wasted at all but had accomplished something worth while, expecting that everyone who read the press of the world would have forgotten his own fervent assertions that the conference must accomplish a great deal in order to save the world from complete disaster, as well as Ramsay MacDonald's and Cordell Hull's almost hysterical appeals to the conference to save our civilization. I very much prefer the brutal truth of a man I have no use for at all—Dr. Hjalmar Schacht, the Nazi head of the German Reichsbank. Speaking over the radio from Berlin, he flatly called the conference a complete failure and answered MacDonald by declaring that Germany would not again participate in a world conference, but only in smaller gatherings devoted to specific purposes.

Now I well know all the stock excuses that will be offered for Mr. Roosevelt's performance—that he could not publicly admit failure; that he wisely kept alive the hope that there was still some life in the conference; that in view of the preconference prophecies of world disaster if it failed, it was necessary for him to head off any feeling of complete despair. But when all is said and done, his statement boils down to complete deceit and such obvious and silly deceit that it is bound to do far more harm to his standing and reputation than any good that might be achieved by his telegram. The conference was in session too short a time for people to forget the words with which it was ushered in; certainly nobody in public life in any part of Europe can have read that telegram from Washington without ribald laughter. But it is true that what Roosevelt did is precisely what most heads of governments, at least those of Anglo-Saxon stock, would have done in his place. Herbert Hoover was certainly a master in the art of misleading public statements and there is no more striking example of this kind of self-deceit—when it is that—and rationalizing than President Wilson's assurance to the American people, on his return from Paris, that the bastard peace treaty he brought back with him embodied each and every point that he had gone to Paris to achieve.

If in the case of Woodrow Wilson it was self-deceit to keep up his own fervent belief that he was beyond the possibility of error or failure, in other cases in recent years this rationalizing by our Presidents is due primarily to the fact that when men take high office they feel themselves freed from the ordinary moralities and decencies. They find that the diplomatic game is largely one of bluff, lying, and deceit, of stealing secrets and private dispatches, and they assume too readily the same attitude toward their other relations with the public. I am told that to one who in the Belgian relief days charged Herbert Hoover to his face with lying, Hoover with admirable frankness replied that he would never think of doing so to his own advantage or that of any other member of his family, but that the cause in which they were engaged warranted a disregard of truth. Nothing could put the case more clearly. Soon after that we were in the war, and lying became the chief activity of the United States Government on the quite defensible ground that you could not win the war in any other way, especially since every other government was devoting its best energies to just that thing.

Is it any wonder that statesmen in peace time continue to think that the Commandments do not apply to them when they are working for the welfare of great masses of human beings, when they know so perfectly just how high-minded and altruistic they, the statesmen, are? Here we have one of the pitfalls of men in high office, especially to be illustrated by Mr. Hoover and Mr. Wilson—this dreadful certainty that they cannot be wrong, that they cannot make mistakes, that they alone know what is right and what is best for the people of whom they are so properly and justly the guardians. Here is where the deadly, character-wrecking influence of high office and vast authority over millions of one's fellow-men does its most effective work—in the swelling of the ego until we sometimes get a pathological case. It does not take long for the king, crowned or uncrowned, to believe, with all his heart and with complete sincerity, that he can do no wrong. There are exceptions—Harding, for instance. He knew too well his own limitations and shortcomings and his feet were much too solidly on earth for him to be able to persuade himself that he was anything but a very ordinary politician washed up into the White House by a fortunate series of political deals. But in the main, given the type of man who now usually finds his way to high office it is just a matter of calculation how long it will be before the symptoms will appear.

None the less I am sorry to see them appearing so early in Franklin Roosevelt. It seems to me that he would today stand much better with the American people and the world if he had issued a statement that read something like this:

> Fellow-Citizens, I am profoundly sorry that the World Conference for which we had such high hopes, has come to nothing, especially as I am charged in many quarters at home and abroad with responsibility for the failure. I can see now that it was a mistake to have it meet without previous agreement upon an exact agenda and finding out in advance some measures upon which all the participants could agree. I must admit guilt, too, in that after the con-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ference met, our own circumstances, and the conditions of our recovery changed so much that I had to alter my opinion as to what the conference should do in the matter of currency stabilization. I am also sorry that I did it with so much heat and feeling. But while the failure of the conference is a disaster and very much jeopardizes the world's recovery, I have not lost hope, so successful is our plan for recovery and so evident are the signs in other countries of rapid improvement.

But a simple, honest, gentlemanly gesture like this is not to be expected of a president or a prime minister; it does not go with the job. Indeed I am not a bit surprised to read that the President is more pleased by his abominably rude, unjust, and inconsistent attack upon the conference for undertaking to do just what he asked it to do than by anything else he has done. The press reports that he is convinced that the American people, or the majority of them, are delighted with the swift kick that he administered to the conference. They rejoice that he told those European welchers "where they got off," so he is entirely content. Why not? The king, I repeat, can do no wrong.

It is just because of this danger that I worry so much over the indications that we are in for a "stand-by-the-President" hysteria, with everybody being denounced as unpatriotic who does not throw up his hat for the N.R.A. and get a blue eagle into his front window instantly. That isn't kindness to the President. His friends can do him no better service than to criticize quietly and efficiently and earnestly, when there is something to criticize. No Administration is safe without criticism; the best man in the world will go wrong if there are no checks upon him, and the best check remains that of honest dissent publicly expressed. If Mr. Roosevelt does not encounter that he is going to fall into a lot of errors besides the Home Loan Act.

Oswald Garrison Villard

Mine War in Pennsylvania

By DANIEL ALLEN

Fayette County, Pa., August 6

FROM the H. C. Frick mines in Fayette County the coal strike has spread swiftly and spontaneously into Washington, Westmoreland, Greene, and Alleghany Counties. The entire soft-coal and coke region has been affected; 70,000 miners have struck and as many as 150 mines have shut down. Passing up and down the Monongahela River, one sees the unsmoking shafts, the huge steam shovels drawn up, the coalwagons and trains bunched motionless, and along the highways into the mine country the long lines of the pickets. There they sit and stand and walk in small compact groups at the entrances to the mines, or trail for long stretches on the road, sticking to the narrow dirt sideways. This is a rank-and-file strike, a picket strike, and the hagglings of their leaders seem here spurious and irrelevant.

This strike is like the war in China: it has never been declared. John L. Lewis had agreed to wait till the code was issued. Local leaders have been discouraging the walkouts. "But we just had to walk out," they tell you all along the line. The H. C. Frick mines have always been anti-union. Men who attended union meetings found themselves on an unsought furlough. In the past few years the miners here and elsewhere have been so ill paid that many who were working had to be put on relief. They got nothing for dead time—for work, that is, other than the actual loading of the wagons—and they could be put to such work for entire days. There was this business of slack wagon and dirty coal, where they didn't overload or "hump" their wagons enough and were docked, or where some of the dust still clung to the coals and they got nothing for the mining and loading. Men known for their union activity were assigned to posts where, crowded together and jammed close to the wagons, they couldn't help having slack wagons. When, lately, operations in idle mines were being resumed, the men were still being docked for one thing or another, with money off for insurance, for back rent, for back relief, and back taxes. Storekeepers in Brownsville tell me of sixty-nine-cent pay envelopes. The union then became a bread-and-butter necessity. It was no matter of propaganda and organization. The men were driven together. It had to be the union or nothing. The checkweighman grievance, however keenly the men feel about it, is subordinated to the recognition of the union, and they resent the efforts of John L. Lewis to make this grievance the big issue on which alone to settle the strike. "We'll take one dollar a day if once we've got union recognition."

I was in the lines with the strikers when they received the news of the Washington agreement. The Pittsburgh *Post-Gazette* of the next day, Saturday, speaks of the "lusty cheers from the throats of the tired pickets for Roosevelt, Pinchot, and the New Deal." I didn't hear any cheers. "It's funny they know all about the strike being over, and we don't," was what they said. It would not be over till they had union recognition. Lewis's signature was of no account.

They find the unaccustomed words difficult—recognition, code, recovery. They are slow of speech. But they do not resent my questioning them sharply, insistently. Among the younger men, some no more than boys, there are those who speak freely and brightly. "What right has Lewis to settle a strike he refuses to call?" A sign bears the words, "This is 1933, not 1922," harking back to the time when Lewis is said to have sold them out. "For how much?" is the grim question. But this time it is different. It is their strike. Much has been made of their patriotism. They do look to Roosevelt and the New Deal. The idea of an Administration favorable to organized labor has won them over. In their own immediate neighborhood they know the impossibility of a partnership of capital and labor. There in Washington it may be. But Roosevelt is on probation. He will have to show himself a labor man.

It is easy to see how a corrupt and reactionary leadership has been able to gain the support of these men and to keep it. Most of them have a strong feeling of inferiority.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

When I question them, it is hard getting past their inevitable, "I don' know nothin' 'bout that." For intricate dealings with the companies and representations to the outside world they feel a glibber speech and a more worldly experience are needed. A divergence of interests is even taken for granted. They can tolerate a great deal. But they are learning. There is a desire stirring in the ranks now to oust their present leadership when they have succeeded in establishing the union. They will in one breath speak of loyalty to their leaders, local and national, and in the next ask what sort of leadership it can be which disclaims responsibility for a rank-and-file strike. The strike has produced its own leaders, strong, close, cautious, bitter men; such a one is Martin Ryan at Colonial No. 3 and 4. A sense of solidarity with their fellow-workers in other fields is developing among the men. The Leith miners helped call out on strike the girls at the Berkowitz Shirt Company in Uniontown. A word about the dairymen's strike in New York State sets them tingling. They have been able to catch a glimpse of insidious interrelationships about them. Certain newspapers are banned as company sheets. Over at the Mellon-controlled Pittsburgh Coal mine at Crescent, the Pittsburgh *Post-Gazette* had distributed gratis its headline celebrations of the formation of a company, or "Amos-and-Andy," union. At Colonial No. 3 where Padorsky had been murdered by deputies, cameramen were present when deputies sneaked up over the mound above the road and pelted the pickets with stones. This picture was not taken. The men remember these things and have begun to resent newspapermen. They are quick to detect a hostile or a patronizing attitude. They refused indignantly to pose with beer jugs for a New York Daily *News* correspondent. "This is no goddam beer party," they said. "We'll give you a strikers' picture, that's all we'll give you."

Louis Padorsky's funeral came the day after Lewis agreed to call the strike off. The roads to Brownsville are long lines of cars and demonstrating marchers. The talk in the procession is all of the strike settlement. There are the timid and the militant. I ask a young miner from a Hillman Coal mine what would be the result of another Lewis sell-out. "The National Miners," he answers shortly. "We'll go back," somebody else says, "if the President of the United States tells us to go back." And a third, "We ain't goin' back till we got recognization of the union." "We aren't Bolsheviks," the first miner tells me, and he points to the wooden houses on their brick bases, the porches with their inevitable swings and rocking chairs, and he points to the rolling brown and blue and green of the hills and valleys and the pinkish mist of the mountain ridge on the horizon, and he asks me, "Do we look like Bolsheviks? Does this look like Bolshevik country?" And he sets his jaws stubbornly, "But we want the right to live like human beings."

The operators, the Administration, and the labor leaders are plenty worried over the mood of the men. They have reason to be. In the towns the people tell you the miners mean business as never before. The left-wing National Miners Union is everywhere urging the men not to quit till the strike has been genuinely won. Will the men go back? They may, they may already have gone back by the time this is published. But all around me I hear, "This strike is just beginning." If they do not go back what will happen to President Roosevelt's merry partnership of capital and labor? The class struggle has not yet been exorcised.

Labor Racketeering

By HAROLD SEIDMAN

THE National Industrial Recovery Act forces employers to be fair in their dealings with labor, but what is going to protect labor from the tyranny of corrupt leaders who have long ruled over many unions? A Tammany sachem could not do a more thorough job than the labor bosses who reign supreme by means of gangsters, graft, machine-made constitutions, and judiciously distributed patronage. Under the leadership of these unscrupulous officials both local and international, every known type of racketeering flourishes. Most of the union czars have risen from the ranks. Once in power they are confronted by numerous temptations. They have the characteristic American love for easy money, and politicians and equally corrupt employers are willing to supply them with plenty of it in return for "favors." Unfortunately, union leadership in this country is for the most part notoriously lacking in social conscience, and more often than not union officials use their position to further their own interests.

Tribute exacted from both the employers and union members swells the already oversized incomes of labor racketeers who, according to federal estimates, are intrenched in forty-seven trades. Protesting victims are soon silenced by strong-arm squads, and the czar's political influence is usually sufficient to quash any court action. To date only two of these racketeers have been brought to justice. Sam Kaplan, president of Local 306 of the Motion Picture Operators, was found guilty of coercion, and Patrick J. Commerford of the Union of Operating Engineers, a Tammany leader, ran afoul of that bugaboo of all racketeers—the income-tax law.

The salaries paid to the union officials are out of all proportion to the service they perform. Sam Kaplan, who spent one or two days a week in the union office, received $21,800 a year, and his successor, Harry Sherman, was granted a salary of $18,000. No previous president of Local 306 had ever received more than $250 a year. P. J. Morrin, president of the International Association of Bridge, Structural, and Ornamental Iron Workers is paid $15,000 a year, all necessary expenses, and $12 a day for daily expenses. Louis Kaufmann, business agent of Local 244 of the Motion Picture Operators, is said to receive $14,000 a year. Although the majority of the union members are now unemployed, the salaries have not been reduced during the depression.

In addition to their salaries, the czars receive other monetary benefits from the union. Over a five-year period Kaplan was "voted gifts" amounting to $55,000 by the union. Three weeks after his last "gift" of $25,000, Kaplan announced to the startled brotherhood that the union was broke. Officials of unions are also usually allowed from $30

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to $50 a month for the upkeep of luxurious automobiles presented to them by the union. In one New Jersey local the president had $300 worth of dental work done at the union's expense. Yet the labor racketeer has not been satisfied with his seemingly adequate stipend and has found other lucrative sources of income.

Incomes of the large unions run into huge sums. The boss has complete charge of this money and rarely accounts for expenditures. Members of Local 3 of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Engineers brought a suit against the local officials to account for $7,500,000 of union funds, much of which they claimed had been used illegitimately. This is the same union which contrary to all union principles entered into an agreement with the New York Edison Company not to organize its employees. Jacob S. Solomon, secretary of the organizing committee of Local 3, admitted that he had secretly destroyed the vouchers and records of the expenditures of close to $1,500,000 between 1926 and 1930 because he feared that "spies" would gain access to the records, and Wilson, the president, agreed that considerably more than $1,000,000 had been spent without authorization. In 1926 before H. H. Broach, who has just resigned as head of the International, took office, the union spent $2,130 in legal fees; between 1927 and 1930, Broach spent $532,000 for legal services. The case for an accounting was suddenly settled last fall. According to a letter sent to Police Commissioner Mulrooney by a committee of the union, "the accounting case was settled by guaranteeing the men who brought the action one year's work in addition to a cash settlement."

Sam Kaplan made no accounting during his entire term of office. He was held in contempt of court by Judge May for failure to produce the books of the union. In a case now pending trial, members of suspended Local 52 of the Iron Workers charge that John M. Schilling financial secretary of the local for twenty-four years, never gave an accounting during all this time. They found the auditor's report he presented this year unsatisfactory, and allege that Schilling refuses to account for $100,000 of the union's money.

To enrich the treasury of Local 306 further, Kaplan introduced the permit system by which non-union men are allowed to work on union jobs. This was done without the consent or knowledge of the members of the union. Under his rule there were 600 permit men who paid initiation fees ranging from $500 to $1,000 and 20 per cent of their salaries to the union. Permit men receive much lower wages than the regular card holders, and have absolutely no voice in union councils. They are not recognized as union members, but they are liable for certain levies and assessments. Harry Sherman, the new president, is now making an effort to reform this system which is still maintained in Local 306.

Tom Maloy employed the same system in Local 110 of the Motion Picture Operators of Chicago. Non-union men claimed that they could obtain jobs by paying Maloy or his representative, Pete Kitcheos, sums ranging from $450 to $1,000. However, they soon found themselves out of work again if they did not continue to pay tribute to Maloy after the initial instalment. If the permit man lost his job, he had to give Maloy another huge "gift" to obtain work. In addition to this, the permit men gave 10 per cent of all their earnings to Local 110. Permit men occupy jobs which ordinarily would go to the regular members of the union. Many unemployed card men are willing to take a permit man's job, but they cannot get them. In Chicago men who had been members of the union since 1910 were without work while permit men held good jobs. Pleas to the local officials were unavailing.

Another racket practiced by union officials is to send a man out on a job paying, say, $100 a week. The employers pay this money not to the worker, but to an official of the local who gives the worker a salary of $50 a week and pockets the other $50. The employee pays 10 per cent of his $50 into the union treasury. Even workers who receive starvation wages must pay part of their pittance to the union for protection. Thirteen complainants, seven of whom were women, brought charges against the Teamsters and Chauffeurs Union in Hudson County, New Jersey. The affidavits alleged that the women, who were cleaners and pressers, were forced to pay from one dollar to two dollars as weekly fees to what was termed a cleaners' branch of the union for the privilege of working unmolested. Some of the women's salaries amounted in all to only five or six dollars a week.

Employers also contribute their share to the labor czar's revenue. Kaplan, Brandle, and Fay, in addition to being representatives of the workers, were also big business men. Sam Kaplan was head of a non-union company which manufactured projection machines. Brandle, fourth vice-president of the International Union of Iron Workers, was president of the Labor National Bank of Jersey City and an officer of the Branleygran Company, dealers in insurance and bonds. The Branleygran Company, which was the second largest holding company in the State, wrote bonds for construction work. Joseph Fay, head of Local 825 of the Union of Operating Engineers, was part owner of the International Excavating Company which rented out ten dump trucks and several steam shovels to building contractors. The wise employer patronized these firms. John Springer of the Springer-Cocalis theater circuit stated that

> although the prices of Sam Kaplan's company were higher than the prices of his competitors, we thought it a wise policy to pay much higher prices to Sam Kaplan's company and insure freedom from labor troubles in our theaters. Our records further show that when we gave all of our business to Sam Kaplan's company, no attempts to unionize our theaters were made, but that when we ceased to patronize Sam Kaplan's company, the attempts of Local 306 to unionize our theaters became aggressive and were marked by violence.

An amusing story is told of how one of the trucks from Sam Kaplan's company drove up to instal equipment in the Ward theater in the Bronx when that theater was being picketed by Kaplan's own union. Union theaters which patronized Kaplan's firm were allowed to employ one card man at $85 a week and four permit men at $45 to $50 a week. Others had to use five regular men at $85 a week.

"Gifts" to the union boss usually prevent all labor difficulties. Patrick J. Commerford, vice-president of the Building Trades Council and delegate at large of the International Union of Operating Engineers, was on the pay roll of several non-union companies. The Carlton Hoisting Company paid him $25 a week in 1927 and $50 a week in 1928 and 1929 to keep it free of labor trouble. The cash was kept in a safe until a sizable amount accumulated and then Commerford would call for it. The United Hoisting Company

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

paid Commerford $75 a week for the same services. These gifts were for protection against Commerford's own union.

Strike breaking was another of Commerford's specialties. He received $7,000 from the W. R. Gahagan Company to call off a strike, and $5,000 from R. J. Murphy Company to break up a strike at Jones Beach. Theodore Brandle and officials of other New Jersey locals of the Iron Workers split a $10,000 "gift" from the Iron League of New Jersey. Brandle was also director general of the Iron League, an employers' organization. He said he was going "to serve both sides."

The czar, who exercises absolute control of the distribution of jobs, preserves his power by giving the best ones to his supporters. Members of the opposition soon find themselves unemployed. Local 11 of the Newark Iron Workers used the "card-index" system for the purpose of discrimination. Under the "card-index" system a worker may receive a job only when the card bearing his name appears at the head of the file. When he receives work his card is moved to the end of the file. A job given to a favorite might last for several months, while a member not in the good graces of the officials of the union might receive work only lasting a day and yet have to wait his turn before receiving another job. Chancellor Berry said that workers in this union were oppressed almost to the point of serfdom. Sam Kaplan appointed the business agents of Local 306, and the business agents distributed the jobs. No member of Local 3 of the Electrical Workers was permitted to accept employment without permission of the local officials. Other bosses use the same methods.

If a member persists in his attacks on the administration, he is soon suspended or expelled from the union and loses his means of livelihood. Many union constitutions are so written that the czar can always find a pretext for suspending or expelling a member. A member can be fined hundreds of dollars, suspended, or expelled for "improper conduct," "committing a nuisance," "using his own automobile in a manner considered unfair to other members or against the best interests of the local," "creating or attempting to create dissatisfaction or dissension," "disturbing the harmony of meetings," "using profane language in the property of the local union," "revealing the business of the union to outsiders," and "attending any meetings or conferences having for their purpose the criticism of any officers or representatives of the district council." The Iron Workers must also take the following oath: "I will at all times be respectful in word and action to every woman, and be considerate to the widow and orphan, the weak and the defenseless." The constitutions are often drawn up by hand-picked committees selected by the czar.

Joseph Blek was suspended from Local 3 of the Electrical Workers on the charge of working with non-union men. The men were actually members of his own union, and Judge Martin stated in his opinion that "the alleged charges were merely a pretext to discipline the plaintiff." Fourteen members of the same union who attended a meeting for "the restoration of union rights of Local 3" were suspended for a year and fined $300 each. Alexander Polin was beaten up and expelled from Kaplan's union for asking for an accounting.

Although Judge Peter Schmuck declared that unions which expelled their members for taking their grievances to court were not only "ridiculous" but were "assuming governmental authority which would not be tolerated by the government," yet most unions still provide for the immediate expulsion of members who go to court before exhausting their resources within the union. Union trials (and often the conviction is had without any) are notorious farces. The highest authority to which a member can appeal is the international convention which is held every two, three, or four years, provided it is not postponed to save expenses. The convicted member may wait as long as eight years before being heard, and then there is little likelihood of the original decision being reversed. In the Carpenters Union during the last eight years 102 appeals were taken to the executive board from the rulings of the international president. In every case the decision of the international head was confirmed.

If the opposition does succeed in wresting the power from the czar, the international often steps in and suspends the local; and another union is established in the same territory with the ousted officials in power. The constitution of the Iron Workers contains the following clause:

> The general president shall, whenever in his judgment subordinate bodies or the members thereof are working against the best interest of the International Association, have the power to order said body to disband or cease such practices under penalty of revocation of charter. He may personally, or by deputy take possession of, for examination, all books, papers, and financial accounts of all subordinate bodies.

The president of the Electrical Workers has the same power.

Patrick J. Commerford was appointed supervisor of Local 125 of the International Union of Operating Engineers by President Possehl to "eliminate graft and corruption." The same system was installed in eighteen other locals. Commerford appointed all the officers and there were no elections. When the union rebelled and removed Commerford, Local 125 was suspended and a new Local 130 was formed with Commerford as its supervisor. He informed contractors that they must deal with the new local. A similar procedure has apparently been followed in the case of Local 52 of the Iron Workers. When John M. Schilling, a vice president of the International, was not reelected financial secretary, Local 52 was suspended and a new Local 447 was formed with Schilling as financial secretary.

Gangsters and strong-arm men are employed by the racketeers to intimidate the members of the union. Kaplan had four bodyguards whose salaries were paid out of the union treasury. Men who became too obstreperous at meetings were silenced by these thugs. One of them, Teddy Greenberg, was sentenced to six months for assaulting Cecil Woods, Jr., a member of the opposition party of Local 306, but Kaplan saw to it that the union continued to pay Greenberg his salary of $125 a week during his term of imprisonment. Henry Godel, an active critic of the officers of Local 3 of the Electrical Workers, was recently murdered. Sternburg, Young, Clohessy, Martin, Terry, and Malone were all severely beaten up, and Sorenson and Dooner were shot in the union offices. A member of the union who testified in court against Van Arsdale, who was accused of shooting Sorenson, had acid thrown in his face and lost the sight of his right eye. Dissenters in Local 110 of the Motion Picture operators met similar fates.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A fight between the Touhys gangsters and the Humphreys gangsters to gain control of the teamsters union in Chicago provided even more spectacular displays of violence. Eighty-three-year-old Steve Summer, an officer of the union for more than thirty years, had bullet-proof glass windows in his home, steel mesh on the windows, and a porthole for a rifle in the door to protect him against invaders. One mob drove up to the union headquarters with a battery of machine guns, automatic shotguns, and revolvers and announced "we are taking over the place for the day." They were driven out a few days later in a counter revolution. Sass and Goldberg, officers of the union, were abducted, and the home of Arthur Metzger, a business agent, was bombed when he refused "a fabulous salary to retire and revoke the union's membership in the American Federation of Labor." There were seven bombings in forty-eight hours at the height of the guerrilla warfare.

Union treasuries are milked by the czars not only to defend themselves, but their gangsters. Greenberg was defended on numerous occasions by high-priced union lawyers. Each member of Local 306 was assessed $21 to provide a $25,000 fee for Max Steuer who defended Sam Kaplan against an indictment based on charges made by members of the union. Kaplan also spent $3,000 a week for an intensive advertising campaign to "maintain the reputation of Local 306." The administration of Local 3 of the Electrical Workers requested $1,500 for the legal defense of Constantino who was accused of shooting Sorenson and Dooner. When a member moved to use the $1,500 for the medical expenses of Sorenson, he was ruled out of order.

International officers have done little to remedy the situation. Instead, they often give aid and comfort to unscrupulous officials by laying all dissension within the unions to "radicals" and "labor spies." At the convention in 1932, P. J. Morrin, International President of the Iron Workers, said that

> in the Eastern section of the country, especially the Newark [Brandle] district, our organization has been cursed with a lot of radical activities which have kept that organization embroiled in internal conflict for the past two years. They have kept up constant wrangling and dissension within the ranks of their local union accompanied by radical bulldozing tactics seeking either to rule or ruin. I myself visited our Newark local union and pointed out to them the dangers of permitting their internal dissension to continue, and the dangers of permitting these dissensionists to lurk within their ranks. I urged them to forget their differences and disregard the wild, radical propaganda made to them by radical members within their own ranks.

Morrin apparently changed his mind about the source of the troubles in the Newark unions this June when he removed Brandle, Sherlock, and the other officials for misuse of powers.

H. H. Broach attributed the trouble in Local 3 to the work of "labor spies." The June, 1932, issue of the *Journal of Electrical Workers* bore on its cover the legend, "Union Destroyers Exposed." A series of obviously faked letters from one "G. Edgar Applegate" of the "American Financiers Protective and Investigation Bureau" to his agent "Bartly" were published in this issue. No record of the concern or of Applegate has ever been found. Broach asserted that he had several investigating organizations working, and promised further "startling results."

When anyone discloses the rotten conditions within a union, he is immediately branded as a union destroyer and enemy of labor. The *Electrical Workers Journal* launched a vicious attack against Louis Budenz, one of the most conscientious and highly respected workers in the American labor movement, because he criticized the administration of Local 3 in an article for *Labor Age*. Bugniazet, the editor of the *Journal*, claimed among other things that "Budenz almost ruined the Hosiery Workers financially, and was forming an outlaw group in Philadelphia known as Hosiery Workers Branch No. 1." Budenz's suit for libel is now pending trial. Many people have hesitated to expose the labor racketeers because they feared that they would be accused of attempting to undermine the structure of the trade-union movement in the United States.

Complaints by members of labor unions have received little sympathy from authorities representing a corrupt political machine in New York. District Attorney Crain was very slow to act on the Kaplan case. Waiters of Local 1 who complained that they were being forced to pay from $100 to $300 for jobs which lasted only six weeks were turned away from Crain's office. One of them, Ben Glast, embarrassed the District Attorney's office by taking the law into his own hands and shooting two agents of the union. Daly, head of the complaint bureau, gave the lame excuse that "he had not gone into the matter to protect the union members, and it was considered wiser to let the complaining waiters handle the early stages of the prosecution themselves."

All union czars have powerful political connections which probably explains in some degree the reluctance of the public prosecutors to act. Tom Farley of tin-box fame, the sheriff ousted by former Governor Franklin D. Roosevelt, was dictator of the Cleaning and Dyeing Industry at a salary of $50,000 a year, and was an honorary member of Kaplan's union. Kaplan instructed his men to vote the straight Democratic ticket, and purchased five motion-picture sound trucks with union funds to aid the Democratic Party in its 1930 campaign. Former Senator Baird said that Brandle and Hague were the "owners" of the Democratic Party in New Jersey. It was Brandle's certified check for $60,000 that settled Hague's income-tax difficulties. Tom Farley, former sheriff Charles W. Culkin, and District Leader James Hines were reported to be the political angels of Local 3 of the Electrical Workers. Pat Commerford was himself a Tammany leader.

Organization of workers has been greatly stimulated by the National Industrial Recovery Act, and the labor racketeer is looking forward to even more lucrative pickings in the future. The American Federation of Labor, a fundamentally weak organization, has not the power to act. All President Green can do is issue proclamations and make recommendations. He has been doing this during the past two years with negligible results. It is extremely difficult to amend the present constitutions of the unions, and this precludes all possibility that the unions will be able to do their own housecleaning.

If labor is to be properly represented in drawing up the codes of fair practice and in collective bargaining, the federal government must find the means of driving out the labor racketeer. One may doubt that the committee to investigate racketeering headed by Senator Copeland of Tammany Hall will be capable of finding the solution.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The NRA Speeds Up

By PAUL Y. ANDERSON

Washington, August 5

THE recovery program is very definitely under way. Despite the sullen and bitter opposition of the steel, oil, coal, and lumber barons, and the financiers who actually control them; despite the idle sniping of lily-fingered "liberals" who will be satisfied with nothing less than paradise by high noon; despite poisoned arrows from without and monkey wrenches from within, it is moving with astonishing speed. I say astonishing, although no one is astonished who is familiar with the terrific labor and devotion back of the program and the dire suffering which it aims to end. If I were a prophet instead of a humble reporter of events, I should not only say that it will succeed, but that it will serve as a transition stage to an early socialization of industry on a scale which no living adult could reasonably have hoped, twelve months ago, to witness. Such a statement may seem optimistic to those who are still thinking in the outworn, conventional, standard political terms of 1932, but I question whether anyone who is not a first-hand observer can appreciate the changes which have taken place here. Perhaps it is all a gigantic fraud, or a fantastic dream, but the persons in it appear to be very real, and extremely familiar.

* * * * *

IT would be cruel to describe in detail the holy show which Frances Perkins and Donald Richberg made of the steel magnates. It has been common knowledge for a good many years that the industry was not oversupplied with brains, but why it should have chosen poor old Bob Lamont to give an example of what one NRA official described as "the complicated stupidity which characterized the Hoover Administration," must forever remain a mystery. As an eye-witness of the spectacle, I can testify to its ghastliness. Even the lame drama of renouncing its claim for government sanction of company unions was spoiled in advance for the industry. Lamont's halting plea for the steel code was simply ripped to pieces by Miss Perkins, and Richberg completed Lamont's humiliation by asking a series of schoolboy questions which he lacked either the knowledge or the authority to answer. The decorum of the procedure was almost destroyed by a succession of volcanic guffaws which resounded along the press tables. The fact is that the code submitted by the steel industry was regarded from the beginning by recovery officials as an insult or a very poor joke. For the steel men to have supposed that they could obtain government sanction of company unions, reinstatement of a modified "Pittsburg-plus" price-basing system, and prohibition of any equipment reducing the cost of production, was simply another evidence of "the complicated stupidity" which seems to characterize most large business undertakings in this country. The fact is that the steel industry is in very bad grace with the recovery administration. It will be given one more opportunity—and a brief one—to show signs of repentance. Very few informed persons in this vicinity expect it to take advantage of that opportunity, in view of the United States Steel Corporation's responsibility for the recent bloodshed in Pennsylvania. What will happen then? Johnson and Roosevelt will simply prescribe a new steel code—and the industry will be confronted with the choice of accepting it or declaring a revolution against the New Deal.

* * * * *

AS I have possibly intimated, there are many phases of this situation which entertain and satisfy. Consider, for example, the spectacle of the power trust rushing to Washington to plead for the protection of a code. The power trust, of course, is one of the few industries which has not been hurt by the depression. In some mysterious way it has managed to maintain rates, while cutting wages. But suddenly it is afraid. Whether this is conscience or a consciousness of guilt, I cannot say, but the result is the same. The oil people, with their eternal—and internal—bickering, have just about succeeded in making out a good case for the nationalization of that industry. It is my guess that Johnson, after listening to them for several days, will let them stew in their own juice for a week, and then prescribe a code for them. The oil industry is almost impossible. The big producers cannot agree with the "independents," the States cannot agree with each other, and State officials cannot agree among themselves. At this time it looks as if Johnson and Roosevelt eventually will be compelled to tell them how to run their business.

* * * * *

THE big hurdle which has always confronted the recovery program was the possibility of a court injunction. Johnson dodged this very cleverly by devising the "voluntary" blanket agreement, as an alternative to the licensing system authorized by the act. However, Secretary Wallace and Administrator Peek of the Department of Agriculture elected to meet the problem head on—as if to prove, perhaps, that the administration of agriculture is a little bit tougher than the administration of industry. As a result, the whole program is now confronted with the possibility of an injunction by the most reactionary federal judge in the United States—Wilkerson, of Chicago, the man Harry Daugherty put on the bench. Whether Wilkerson will have the nerve to issue such an order is questionable. It can hardly be doubted that he is very bitter against the recovery administration. Richberg was mainly responsible for blocking his promotion by Hoover to the Circuit Court of Appeals. It will be interesting to see whether he is moved more by vindictiveness or fear. I am of the opinion that Wallace and Peek acted somewhat obstinately and injudiciously. The milk racketeers of Chicago afforded a serious problem, but the matter could have been handled in smoother fashion.

* * * * *

AFTER listening to the representatives of the steel and oil industries I thought I had heard from the most benighted and reactionary elements of American industry. But that was a mistake. The Honorable Harry New, Post-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

master-General under Warren Harding and Calvin Coolidge, who was no saint himself, once remarked bitterly in private that of all the greedy, selfish, grasping crew with which he had been compelled to deal, nobody could touch the newspaper publishers. They were not satisfied to have the government transport their product at cost—it must be transported at a loss to the government. They were always looking for the "chiseler's percentage." In the present situation they have run true to type. They have whined, threatened, and attempted something close to blackmail. The agreement submitted to Johnson by a committee of the American Newspaper Publishers Association was a joke. It would have prolonged child labor on the ground that a boy should be permitted to keep his newspaper route; would have exempted editorial workers on the ground that they are "professional men" (although they are not required to undergo technical training, have no freedom as to hours of labor, do not charge fees for their services, and have no organization or code of ethics), and would have excepted mechanical workers under contract. Recovery officials have hesitated to use the big stick on newspaper owners for fear that they would sabotage the whole program. I consider this fear to be entirely groundless. In one five-minute speech on the radio Roosevelt could break the back of every newspaper slacker in the country. As a matter of fact, their situation has already become extremely delicate. Their pages are filled with advertisements which flaunt the Blue Eagle, but it is missing from their mastheads. I recognize the existence of an honorable minority. But for every Patterson, Pulitzer, or Stern, for every Milwaukee *Journal,* there are a dozen like Harry Chandler, Howard Davis, and Frank B. Noyes. In the end Johnson may be compelled to bring the newspapers under a code designed for a profession at least more ancient and possibly as honorable as journalism.

The Teacher Faces the Depression

By EUNICE LANGDON

ON April 27, according to the New York *Times,* Paul Schneider, aged forty-four, a sick and crippled Chicago school teacher, shot himself to death. His widow, left with three children, stated that he had not been paid for eight months, that his property had depreciated, groceries which his family needed could be bought only on wage assignment, and worry had aggravated his illness. Less than a month after Paul Schneider's discouragement drove him to suicide, the militant action of the Chicago teachers—patient no longer—in invading the banks and refusing to be distracted or amused by the picturesque profanity of Mr. Dawes resulted in the payment of $12,000,000 due them for the last months of 1932. Their pay for the five months of 1933 is still owed them. Four hundred of them are reported to be in asylums and sanitariums as a result of the strain, and are possibly beyond help by this very belated and partial payment. Replies to a questionnaire reveal, according to William G. Carr, director of the Research Division of the National Education Association, that 2,278 teachers in 263 schools have been unable to meet payments on $7,800,567 of life insurance, and 759 have been unable to meet payments on their homes. Large numbers of teachers have borrowed to the limit of their insurance policies and in some cases from loan sharks at exorbitant rates of interest. More than 500, only a part of those who applied, have been assisted by one teachers' charitable foundation. In short, all the horrors of prolonged *unemployment* are incidents of employment in the public-school system of the second largest city in the country, which is conducting a "Century of Progress" exposition.

But the situation of the Chicago teachers, distressing as it is, is far from unique. Because of certain incongruous and sensational angles in the situation which habitually make Chicago "news," the plight of Chicago's teachers has received a relatively large amount of publicity, whereas the equally desperate, perhaps more hopeless condition of teachers in rural schools throughout the South and in many sections of the West and Middle West has gone almost unnoticed. Public education is threatened with something little short of an absolute breakdown in vast areas of the country. Alabama owes its teachers $7,000,000. Eighty-five per cent of its elementary and secondary schools were reported as closed in April of this year and the rest as running on part time. Many schools, according to a statement made by Dr. A. F. Harmon, State Superintendent of Education, closed before January 1 of this year not to open again until October if they do then. Some counties have gone back to a three months' term such as was maintained thirty years ago. Few teachers of elementary, high-school, or college rank in State institutions have been paid their full salaries, and most of them are from three to eight months behind. Even these unpaid salaries had previously been cut from 10 to 40 per cent, as they have in other States. Where they have been paid, it has been only partly in cash and partly in scrip, which merchants in some places are no longer willing to accept. In Georgia, teachers in rural counties have gone unpaid for months and in many places their credit is exhausted. Some of them have met the situation by camping in schoolhouses, cooking their meals in the domestic-science rooms. In some rural communities farmers have helped by taking turns in boarding teachers, but in many instances this has proved too great a burden for the impoverished families. These statements, like many official reports, investigations, and surveys, apply almost wholly to white teachers in white schools. But it is a safe assumption that in those States and counties which normally spend from three to sixty times as much on their white as on their colored schools, the sufferings of the Negro school teachers and of the Negro school population have been proportionately heavier. Here as elsewhere complete breakdown has been averted largely by the devotion of the teachers, who have not only gone on working without pay, but have often out of their depleted means helped needy school children.

And as if this crippled condition of the schools were not sufficiently serious, in every locality cries for further retrenchment from taxpayers' committees, citizens' budget commissions, the bankers, the power interests, the merchants'

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

associations, and the real-estate associations are being heard. To a large extent these have already been heeded, and at a time when unprecedentedly heavy demands are being made on our public schools they have been forced almost everywhere to run on reduced budgets, to cut teachers' salaries, to increase the size of classes, and to drop such "fads and frills" as the teaching of music, child-guidance work, playground work, school gardens, vacation schools—in short, all the myriad developments of the school system which are intelligent responses to the complex needs of the community, the very features which make the public-school system, with all its weaknesses and shortcomings, an asset to democracy.

And what are the results? In Michigan, says George E. Carrothers of the University of Michigan, "a 7 per cent increase in the number of students in Michigan high schools has been accompanied by a 3 per cent decrease in the number of teachers, salary cuts of from 10 to 40 per cent, and the elimination of courses, which is putting an unparalleled burden on teachers and school systems to keep State educational standards up to normal." Detroit has cut its night-school service in half, increased the size of classes, and eliminated free summer schools; Indianapolis has eliminated its department of curriculum revision, eliminated night schools, summer schools, and teachers' colleges, and greatly reduced its appropriations for kindergartens. In Chicago nearly all evening schools have been closed, summer schools have been discontinued, community centers abolished, playgrounds reduced. To quote again from William Carr's recent summary of the situation in the New York *Herald Tribune*:

> One or more phases of school service have been eliminated or curtailed in more than half of the city school systems of the nation. Conservative estimates indicate that by the end of the school year kindergartens will be reduced or eliminated in at least 170 cities, night schools in 120 cities, schools for handicapped children in 170 cities, art instruction in 100 cities, music instruction in 160 cities, school nurses in 135 cities, home economics or manual training or both in 145 cities, and physical education in 160 cities.

A short-sighted "economy" has insisted in all these cases on the elimination or the curtailment especially of those services which even in normal times are the strongest forces against disintegration, demoralization, and gangsterism, and which become acutely necessary in the face of the problems raised by the depression. Professor Paul Mort, of Teachers College in New York, announced last winter after a nationwide survey of educational financing that approximately 9,500,000 American boys and girls were being deprived of their educational birthright because of the depression. As large portions of the survey on which this conclusion was based dealt exclusively with white teachers and white schools it seems safe to regard these figures as highly conservative.

"Education is not sacred," said Mayor McKee at a meeting of the New York City Board of Estimate last October. For this and similar courtesies some 200,000 voters wrote in his name on their ballots in November and many more were prevented from expressing their appreciation only by the "fixing" of Tammany's voting machines. McKee's soul, however, goes marching on. According to an analysis by the Public Education Association, the educational budget for New York City for 1933 suffered the following reductions: First, the budget presented by the Board of Education for 1933 was $2,800,000 less than that for 1932. And since there is normally an annual increase in the budget of $5,000,000 on account of the increased number of pupils, the budget request for 1933 was lower than it normally would have been by approximately $7,800,000. This reduction was accomplished in the main by increasing the size of classes, restricting the number of sessions of evening schools, suspending the summer schools and other summer activities, reducing personnel, using substitutes instead of regular teachers to fill vacancies, and making large cuts in supplies and equipment.

Secondly, this budget request was reduced by the Board of Estimate and Apportionment by $1,500,000, which left it approximately $141,000,000. This reduction was accomplished by the elimination of after-school athletic centers and school gardens, a reduction in the appropriation for baths and pools*, the elimination of certain vacant positions, by transferring from the tax-levy budget inspectors and draftsmen for new building work, and by increasing anticipated accruals.

Thirdly, the budget was further diminished by an act of the extraordinary session of the legislature reducing salaries by $8,800,000 and then, after the reopening of the city budget, by an additional $2,500,000, leaving a net total budget for 1933 of $129,700,000, as compared with $145,300,000 in 1932. This last reduction was accomplished by abolishing training schools, withdrawing sick pay from teachers, filling vacancies with substitute teachers, postponing repairs, improvements, and replacements, and making further reductions in the amounts spent for school supplies. All of these reductions amounted to a total cut of $20,600,000.

There is every reason to fear similar and even more drastic economies for next year as well as a possible reduction in State aid. The teachers who took a straight pay cut last winter of from 6 to 10 per cent, as well as various disguised pay cuts in the form of reduced sick pay, larger classes, increased work, and fewer free periods, and still contributed more than $3,000,000 to the School Relief Fund—a contribution which compares rather favorably with that of bankers, power-company officials, realtors, and other citizens' budget commissioners—are again facing the threat of a pay cut in the Budget Commission's recommendation of a moratorium on all mandatory salary increases and increments. The threat, indeed, to the teachers' security, to their peace of mind, to their efficiency is constant. It is undermining not only their standard of living and tending to nullify the hard-won and justified salary increases of recent years, but also, by the strain and hardship it imposes on teachers, the efficiency of the schools. A harassed, underpaid, overworked, and bullied teaching body is inevitably harmful to the schools.

As Dr. Abraham Lefkowitz of the Teachers' Union recently pointed out in his pamphlet, "Teachers and the Economic Situation," teachers who were public employees were among the last to profit by rising wages in the boom years following 1914. Their salaries were established by law and could not readily be adjusted. The maximum salary for high-school teachers in New York at that time was $2,650, and this was reached only after fourteen years of service. (Again a comparison of the service rendered the community by the teachers and their remuneration with that of some of the members of the Citizens' Budget Commission is sugges-

* The service to the city rendered by these baths and pools can be gauged by the following figures: In the spring of 1931 there were, according to the Association of Day School Teachers of Swimming, 84,396 boys and girls enrolled for attendance at shower baths, and 62,185 enrolled for swimming. Children were examined every week for signs of contagious or other diseases.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tive.) With rising prices, however, the purchasing power of the dollar shrank so rapidly that by June, 1920, with the price index at 216.5, the purchasing power of this maximum salary was $1,219. In August, 1920, as a result of an active campaign by the teachers, the Legislature of the State of New York raised salaries so that the maximum reached $3,700. But the purchasing power of even this maximum was still below that of the maximum of 1913. In 1928-29 a further adjustment raised the maximum salary to $4,500, at which level it remained until the salary cut passed by the extraordinary session of the legislature this winter. In the face of rising prices, however, even the teacher obtaining the present *maximum* salary may soon find himself worse off than he was before his salary was raised—and this even without further wage cuts. The suggested moratorium on increments, while not affecting holders of these maximum salaries would hit all those on the lower salary levels—in itself a very gross injustice.

These are the conditions facing teachers fortunate enough to be employed. What of the unemployed? Their number in New York City alone has been variously estimated at from 5,000 to 15,000. The Teachers' Union, which gives the lower figure, makes a distinction between those actually on eligible lists and those who for some reason have failed or had no opportunity to take the regular license examinations.) The Unemployment Relief Committee was recently said to be supporting 954 of them. Probably very few of the others have had the good luck to reach the stage of destitution at which they will be eligible for relief from the Home Relief Bureau or will be given "made work" by the Emergency Work Bureau. Many are known to have applied unsuccessfully to these and similar organizations. One such teacher, a young girl, according to a letter in the possession of the Unemployed Teachers Association was ineligible because in her family of five people, one, a brother, was working and making $17 a week.

"I passed the oral and written parts of an examination to teach English to foreigners," this girl wrote, "and had to have a postponement in my physical because my teeth are in bad shape and I cannot afford dental care. I've had to stop my work toward a high-school license because I had no money for tuition."

"We are always hungry," wrote another, also one of a family of five, only one of whom had any sort of employment. "We owe six months' rent. . . . We live every hour in fear of eviction. . . . My sister, a typist, and I, a teacher, have been out of work for two years. . . . We feel discouraged . . . and embittered. We are drifting, with no help from anyone." Two other teachers known to the Unemployed Teachers Association were declared "ineligible" because they had been making $5 a week by substitute work. The policy of the Board of Education in letting some permanent vacancies go unfilled and filling others with substitutes at substitutes' per diem pay is largely responsible for the high rate of teacher unemployment. It is a policy disastrous in many ways both to the teachers and to the schools. For the young and hopeful graduates of the training schools and the city colleges who passed their license examinations as far back as 1928 and 1929 and still have not received regular appointments, the situation is tragic. The board has not only decided to hold no further License No. 1 examination, at least until 1934 (to do so would, indeed, be a futile gesture with some 5,000 teachers on eligible lists to be appointed in order of merit) but is filling vacancies as they occur not by making regular appointments from the lists, but very largely by assigning substitutes. Even when these substitutes are taken from the eligible lists with a high ranking they receive only substitutes' per diem pay instead of the regular rate of compensation. They may thus be made to fill regular positions for years as permanent substitutes, doing regular teachers' work at substitutes' pay *without salary increments and without permanent tenure,* which last a regular teacher achieves automatically after three years of teaching in the city system. The consolidation of classes, the dropping of courses, and the closing of the three city training schools has also thrown upon the system a great number of teachers in excess who must be taken care of, still further reducing the chance of appointment from the lists. The appointment of substitutes has in fact reached a point where principals are protesting against it and against the continual shifting of teachers from school to school. (It was estimated last winter that one teacher in five in the high-school system was a substitute and in some schools the proportion is even higher.)

There is another real though insidious danger in manning our schools in so large a measure with teachers who have no secure tenure and are consequently defenseless against political injustice and favoritism, against the infraction of standards which the Teachers' Union and other teachers' associations have labored for years to build up, and against constantly increasing demands on their time and services, without additional compensation. The lack of security is an effective check upon any political or spiritual independence on the part of teachers, and it is particularly to the credit of the Unemployed Teachers Association, the majority of whose members have only a substitute's status, that they have repeatedly championed teachers who they feel had been unjustly treated. Particularly notable were their protests in the case of Ralph Fagin and Helen Weinstein, substitutes, transferred "for the good of the system" after taking part in a parade of a parent-teacher-student association against overcrowded conditions in Public School 225 at Brighton Beach; their demand for an open hearing of the charges against Isidore Blumberg, a dismissed probationary teacher; and their stand against the "tragic case" policy of Superintendent O'Shea, by which the merit system was abandoned and assignments given to teachers alleged to be in distressed circumstances. In the last case the Unemployed Teachers Association pointed out that many teachers thus assigned did not appear on any eligible list, that appointment on grounds of destitution rather than of efficiency was detrimental to the schools, and that unless *all* the tragic cases among the 5,000 eligibles were examined their relative destitution could not be fairly established anyway. It is significant that this "tragic case" list has not been open to inspection like other lists.

In the very tone of the announcements given out by the Board of Education in New York the new and lowered status of the teachers in New York schools is reflected. It was reflected, for instance, in Superintendent O'Shea's announcement that he intended to "draft" teachers for summer-school work without pay, and in the contemplated by-law of the Board of Education compelling them to give extra hours after school without additional remuneration for the purpose of coaching backward students. It was reflected also in the marvelous "share-the-work" plan, suggested but, happily, not

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as yet put into execution. Under this plan two substitutes, through "voluntary cooperation," would alternate in teaching a class, each substitute teaching one week for pay, the next week "voluntarily" assisting her alternate without remuneration. It is also an open secret in the teaching body that the "dear, wonderful, generous teachers," as Mayor O'Brien recently called them, were not wholly free from coercion in the matter of contributions to the School Relief Fund. It is significant too that teachers who have ventured to protest against this and other injustices have frequently drawn the unfavorable attention of their superiors and the whip of impermanent tenure has been held over them explicitly even at open meetings of the Board of Education.

Members of the New York Board of Education and of such boards throughout the country face no easy task. The pressure on them to reduce expenses, even by such disastrous economies as those described above, from all the reactionary elements in the community has been tremendous and is still going on. It is unfortunate that such boards are usually composed of people who are primarily politicians rather than educators and hence overresponsive to pressure of this kind. In the present emergency, moreover, there has been added to the usual reactionary business interests, the voice of the bewildered and overburdened small taxpayer, who may actually be bearing a disproportionate share of the cost of education. The equalization of the tax burden by a form of taxation placing this load where it belongs, State and federal aid to education throughout the nation, the strengthening of teachers' associations everywhere, and determined action against false "economies" by all who realize what is at stake will be needed if the schools and the teaching profession are to be saved from disaster.

Liberia in Shackles

By MAURITZ A. HALLGREN

Washington, August 7

LIBERIA, having already been reduced to helplessness through the financial dictatorship of the Firestone rubber interests, is now, with the aid of the League of Nations and consent of the American State Department, about to be placed in complete servitude. The Liberian government lost its financial autonomy through the 1926 loan agreement, which the State Department compelled it to accept against its will. Within another month it is to be stripped of its administrative independence and cultural autonomy as well. And this is all to be done ostensibly in the name of charity, but really to give the Firestone interests and the National City Bank absolute control of the country so that they may the better "protect" the 1926 loan and the extensive Firestone rubber concession. A "Plan of Assistance for Liberia," upon which a League commission had been working for two years, has been completed, and the Liberians have been informed that they must accept this plan before the League Council meets in September.

The League plan, which the Firestone people helped to write and which they have accepted with certain strings attached, provides for appointment by the League Council of a "chief adviser" to the Liberian government. According to Article 13, Paragraph 1, of the plan, this official "shall be attached to the central government in order to give it the benefit of his advice, to supervise the execution of the plan of assistance, and to coordinate the work of the foreign experts." The third paragraph requires the government "to collaborate with the chief adviser" and "to act in accordance with his advice and recommendations." It also agrees to grant him "ample and sufficient authority" to carry out the plan of assistance.

Liberia is arbitrarily divided "for administrative purposes" into three provinces, and each is to have a provincial commissioner. These commissioners, who will be responsible to the chief adviser, must be "foreign specialists." Technically, according to the plan, they will also be responsible to the President of Liberia, but only on the understanding that the President or his Secretary of the Interior shall issue "no instructions, regulations or orders . . . to the provincial commissioner except after consultation with and approval of the chief adviser." Nor shall this meaningless concession to the executive authority of the republic "be interpreted as intended to limit in any way the authority of the chief adviser as to this or any other department of the government." Moreover, "it shall be his duty to see that the laws and regulations are carried out, and he shall be responsible for public peace and order." To this end a "corps of messengers" is to be organized, it being left to the chief adviser to decide, "in collaboration with the government of Liberia, whether the messengers are to be armed or not." There surely can be no doubt that the chief adviser will be the real ruler of the country.

It is a curious fact that the draft protocol of the plan of assistance does not define or even mention the nature of the help to be extended to Liberia. However, the supplementary financial report suggests that $72,000 *may* be spent annually on "roads, bridges, public health, etc." At the same time it provides that the foreign "experts" engaged for this work are to be paid $78,000 a year for "salaries and travel-expenses to Europe." In addition, the 7 per cent interest rate on the 1926 loan is to be reduced to 5 per cent, and in the event that the interest charges for any year cannot be met out of current revenue the Finance Corporation of America (Firestone) agrees to renounce the interest payment for that year.

Standing alone these provisions would appear to be to Liberia's advantage. The reduction in the interest rate, which has long been sought, will mean a theoretical saving of $62,000 a year, although actually the saving will be less than $50,000 a year, for new bonds must be issued to cover arrears in past interest payments. Moreover, the interest renounced in any year because of inadequate revenues must also be covered by new bonds to be issued by the government to the Finance Corporation. (This provision appears neither in the draft protocol of the plan or the financial report but in a

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

third document—a supplementary loan contract to be entered into between the Liberian government on the one hand and the Finance Corporation and National City Bank on the other.) So Liberia is to be helped, in part at least, by piling new debts on top of its already unbearable obligations!

While the cost of the plan of assistance, estimated at $150,000 annually, is to be borne in the first instance by the Finance Corporation, this expense must eventually come out of the Liberian budget. If this proves impossible, the Finance Corporation is obligated to issue bonds to cover the salaries and traveling expenses of the imported specialists—this it must guarantee in any event—but it need not issue bonds to cover the cost of the new roads and sanitary system. In brief, unless the government can stand the additional strain, the only part of the plan of assistance that can possibly benefit Liberia may be dispensed with at the pleasure of the Firestone interests!

The government had cut its current budget to about $400,000, below which, it declared, it could not go without completely undermining the essential public services. The financial adviser, a Firestone man, insisted that it could be cut to $281,500. The financial rapporteur for the League commission, M. Ligthart, a Frenchman, "compromised" by fixing the figure at $300,000. It is interesting to note that in his report M. Ligthart acknowledges the help he received from L. T. Lyle, representing the Finance Corporation; Harvey Firestone, Jr., representing the Firestone Plantations Company; and General Blanton Winship, representing the United States Government. Here, however, we come upon another discrepancy. The Ligthart report assigns the first $300,000 of revenue to the government for its "ordinary operating expenses." The report definitely states that salaries and expenses of the loan officials and the cost of the plan of assistance must come out of subsequent revenues. But Section XV of the supplementary loan contract mentioned above just as flatly states: "It is understood and agreed that in any fiscal year, after the payment each month of the cost and expenses of the collection, application, audit, and administration of the revenues and receipts, as provided in Section XIII hereof [which section provides for payment of salaries and expenses of loan officials and for maintenance of a frontier guard], any balance of assigned revenues may be applied to the ordinary expenditures of the government until such time as the total revenues and receipts of the government shall exceed $350,000." Again, Section II, paragraph (b), mentions the sum of $350,000 as the amount "required for the operating expenses of the government, including salaries and allowance of the fiscal officials." In a case of this sort is it likely that a recommendation of a League rapporteur will have more force than a contract with the National City Bank?

Incidentally—though incidental only in the sense that it seems less important than some of the more outrageous provisions of the League plan—while the total of the government expenses, salaries, and allowances of the loan officials, loan charges, and cost of the plan of assistance comes to $733,000 a year, estimated revenues for the current year amount only to $456,500. Who is to make up the difference? The Firestone interests? They have gone into Liberia to make money for themselves, not to dispense charity. M. Ligthart believes the problem will solve itself in time. "I am confident that this amount will be increased considerably," he said, "by the application of the plan and by a proper administration, as this will lead to a speedy development of the country and its resources." Quite apart from the difficulty of perceiving how any country can be helped which has dozens of high-salaried, parasitic officials foisted upon it, it is rather hard to follow M. Ligthart's logic. According to the League plan, $72,000 a year *may* be spent on roads, bridges, and public health. It need not be spent unless the government budget can stand the extra burden. M. Ligthart clearly suggests that the budget cannot stand the strain until the country and its resources are developed, that is to say, unless the money is spent!

The League commission is anxious to help Liberia economize. For example, it has recommended that the government stop appropriating funds for educational purposes and leave all education in the hands of missionaries. In short, Liberia is asked to abandon its cultural autonomy as well as its financial and administrative independence. It is obvious that the missionaries must be financed from abroad, primarily by Americans, by such churchly people as the Firestones, for example. The implications of this are too plain to need further discussion.

There remains the question of whether the chief adviser selected by the League Council shall be an American or a person of some other nationality. The Firestone people are insisting on the appointment of an American. General Winship has said that they will have his support. The State Department has pointedly declared that only an American can properly watch out for our interests in Liberia. And it is certain that the League has neither the courage nor the desire to cross the United States Government on this score. An American will be selected—unless Providence intervenes—and it is a foregone conclusion that in as much as "our interests" in Liberia are really Firestone's, the chief adviser will be another Firestone man. Then his control of this republic, which was created as a haven for free Negroes, will be complete. Nor need the Liberians look for help to the State Department, which has shown time and again that it sides with Firestone and the National City Bank as against the people of Liberia.

Despite the League commission's virtual ultimatum, Liberia has thus far refused to accept the plan of assistance. Secretary of State Grimes, the Liberian delegate, appended twelve reservations to the commission's report. Somewhat earlier in the deliberations he had submitted a lengthy memorandum, upon which the subsequent reservations were based. This memorandum was not only a complete presentation of the case for Liberia, but revealed the manner in which the State Department had cooperated with Firestone in saddling the loan contract and financial dictatorship upon the country.

In 1924 the Liberian government agreed to lease to Firestone "a large area of land upon which to plant rubber." Although Firestone's agent, W. D. Hines, approved the terms offered, they were not acceptable to Firestone. Hines was compelled to return the agreement to the government in a "considerably amended" form. The amendments, in brief, required Liberia to accept a loan from Firestone and a "financial adviser" to supervise the administration and collection of the loan. The government informed Hines that "in no circumstance" would it "place itself under financial obligation to your company." It declared subsequently that "it would be politically inadvisable . . . to place the republic under

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

financial obligation to any private concern operating in this country under grants from the government." However, it would be willing, as the Liberian Secretary of State informed the American Minister in Monrovia, to accept "any benevolent assistance in this direction," provided that the money was obtained "from sources other than a corporation or individual operating commercially in Liberia."

Firestone's purpose was obvious. He clearly did not trust the Liberian government. In order to protect the rubber monopoly he determined to put the government under binding obligation to himself—with the approval and assistance of the State Department. He argued that the planting and loan agreements had to be accepted together, because, "first, it establishes confidence in American investments not only for loans, but for the much larger investment for rubber development; second, *the United States Government could not agree to assist a loan on unknown terms and conditions.*" He suggested that he would "raise capital from the American public for Liberia." The Liberian government, he cabled President King, "must have confidence in America and myself." In a cablegram sent to the American Minister in Monrovia a few days later, Secretary of State Kellogg supported Firestone with the declaration that the State Department "awaits with sympathetic interest the conclusion of the contracts now under consideration. . . . *It would seem most unfortunate should a disagreement as to the exact terms of the loan prevent or delay the conclusion of a contract which, from every standpoint, is of immense advantage to Liberia.*" Later Secretary Kellogg stated in another cablegram:

> The department appreciates the reluctance of the Liberian government to assume obligations toward private interests operating in Liberia identical with those which it might willingly assume toward the American government. *Mr. Firestone assures the department that there is no thought of the money for a loan being advanced by the corporation which will be formed to promote rubber developement in Liberia.* . . . the department has already stated that it would, at the request of the Liberian government and American interests advancing the loan, cooperate in the selection of the loan officers. It would appear to this government that these provisions would thoroughly safeguard Liberian interests.

Subsequently the Liberian Secretary of State visited Washington, where he discussed the question of a loan with William R. Castle, Jr., then chief of the Western Europe division of the State Department. He informed Castle that Liberia was not particularly anxious to obtain a loan of any sort, but if the State Department recommended it "as essential and desirable, we were prepared to act upon that advice." But "the department agreed with my views that the money should not come from Firestone." These repeated assurances from the State Department were accepted in good faith by Liberia, and the loan agreement, despite continued and vigorous opposition at home, was finally approved by President King, who conducted the last-minute negotiations in Paris. Under the terms of the agreement a group of American officials took charge directly and indirectly of the whole of Liberia's finances.

At the ninth meeting of the League Committee, held on January 28, 1932, it was disclosed that "notwithstanding the objections of the Government of Liberia, and assurances received in the replies above quoted . . . the loan had been floated by Mr. Firestone, and . . . none of the bonds upon which the money was raised had been put upon the open market. It has since been established that Mr. Firestone is the leading director, if not the sole owner, of the Firestone Company, the Finance Corporation [the dummy company through which the loan was "floated"], and the United States Trading Company. . . ."

Of course, the State Department may have been perfectly sincere in stating that the Liberian government would not be delivered into Firestone's hands under the terms of the 1926 agreement. But if so, why did it insist upon having the contract rushed through, and why did it request the Liberian government not to quibble over the "exact terms" of the contract? And when it discovered that Firestone was putting up the loan himself, why did it not hasten to denounce him for having violated the spirit, if not the letter, of the agreement, and why did it not immediately inform the Liberian government that Firestone had tricked it into accepting the financial dictatorship? Lastly, if the State Department was sincere in the position it took in 1926, why did it later, through the American member of the League Committee, demand that Liberia observe the terms of the agreement to the least insignificant clause, though it must have known, that this course was driving Liberia into bankruptcy?

More than half of the Liberian memorandum was devoted to a detailed description of the efforts of the government to economize in order to comply with the requirements of the Financial Adviser. When the Firestone agents insisted that the government reduce expenditures to protect revenues earmarked for the loan, an investigation was undertaken and it was found that virtually every branch of the government was understaffed. Nevertheless, personnel was still further reduced and salaries were generally slashed, the latter being cut upon one occasion as much as 50 per cent. But this did not suffice and other revenues were diverted to meet payments on the loan and to pay the salaries and expenses of the loan officials, which of course were not affected by the economy drive. Indeed, the salaries of some of these men (though the memorandum does not mention it) have actually been increased. By April, 1930, the government found that it did not have enough free revenue to carry its floating debt or meet its current expenses. It sought to arrange temporary credits with the Bank of British West Afrika, Ltd., in Monrovia, but the bank refused to extend credits without the consent of the Financial Adviser, "which approval the Financial Adviser consistently refused to give." The Fiscal Agent and the Finance Corporation were appealed to in this connection, but their reply consisted "mainly in a series of indictments over questions of procedure and other matters, which in fact were traceable as much to the conduct of the fiscal officers as to others in the employ of the public service," and concluded "with an implied denial to cooperate, suggest, or give any assistance."

Finally, in September, 1932, the Liberian Secretary of the Treasury wrote to the Finance Corporation and to the National City Bank of New York proposing that the agreement be temporarily modified for the fiscal year 1933 by reducing the rate of interest from 7 to 4 per cent, declaring a moratorium on the sinking fund, eliminating two American officers of the Liberian Frontier Force and the American Assistant Auditor, equalizing the salary of the Supervisor of Customs with that of the Auditor and the Supervisor of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Internal Revenue, reducing by 25 per cent the salaries of the Finance Adviser and other fiscal officers, and by agreeing to the government's plan to float a $500,000 internal loan for the purpose of funding the current floating debt. These proposals, while not rejected outright, met with many delays.

Finally, on June 27 of this year after a series of conferences in London, the League plan was drawn up. It was approved by all of the delegates "with the exception of the Liberian representative." He was told that his government must accept the plan "as a whole if it desires the assistance of the League," and must do so before September 1. There can be do doubt that copies of the report were received by the State Department soon after June 27. Yet the report has at no time been made available to the public through the department. Officials of the department were plainly disturbed when they learned that copies, sent from Liberian sources abroad, had reached this country. Apparently it had been hoped to keep the details of the plan from the American public until the League Council had had opportunity to compel Liberia to accept it.

When the full extent of the betrayal of Liberia at the hands of the League became known, a delegation of prominent Negroes, including Dr. Mordecai W. Johnson, president of Howard University; W. E. B. DuBois, editor of the *Crisis,* and Walter White, secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, went to the State Department to protest against American acquiescence in the plan. They were received by Acting Secretary Phillips, who pointedly though politely informed them that the State Department had no intention of changing its policy with regard to Liberia. The delegates, except Dr. Johnson, insisted that if a "chief adviser" had to be sent to Liberia, he should be a non-American, preferably a Scandinavian. They expressed the fear that if he were an American, he would inevitably be a Firestone agent. Phillips, however, declared that he "favored an American expert." "Otherwise," he said, "we would lose our traditional interest in Liberia, which would be unwise." At another point he asked: "What would happen if the Firestone interests were taken out of Liberia? It would mean complete starvation in Liberia." He insisted that in as much as the League had taken up the matter of "helping" Liberia, there was nothing that the State Department could do. If the League appointed an American as "chief adviser," the department would have to accept him. Phillips also defended the high salaries paid to foreign experts on the ground "that we've got to get the very finest men we can find." When the objection was raised that this should not be done at the expense of the Liberian school system, he declared that many States in this country have had to cut down their school budgets. He finally promised to bring the school question to the attention of General Winship, who is now in Monrovia as an official "observer" for the American government.

It seems evident that Firestone will have his way in all things in Liberia. For example, among his many recommendations, M. Ligthart has suggested that the Liberian government grant no "further concessions or monopolies to foreigners, except after consultation with the chief adviser." Thus Firestone need have no fear of competition. And it appears certain that he can depend upon the complete support of the American State Department. Only an aroused public can prevent this new imperialist grab.

In the Driftway

THE attention of the Drifter has been directed to a new organization calling itself the Society for the Advancement of Better Living, with headquarters in the Hotel Astor, New York. Twenty-eight million young Americans have grown into adulthood in the last few years, so an announcement says, "with the most meager knowledge of the civilized pleasures of the table, with no design for dining. Their gastronomic experiences have been marked by heedless dash or mere indifference, and steeped—shall we say?—in juniper." The new society will be devoted, it is said, to the "epicurean arts." Certainly the epicurean arts need somebody's devotion, preferably that of a large, strong man with a tomahawk, who will devote his long winter evenings to a massacre of restaurant proprietors and cooks. For the restaurateur of the present century has pretty well driven out of public places that once matchless creation, American cooking, forcing it to take refuge in a select number of private homes. Foreign immigration has been partly responsible for this. Pathetically eager to become "Americanized," the newcomers—with the honorable exception of the Italians—have tended to cast aside their own sound traditions in regard to food and embrace our own before they had any but the shoddiest conception of what the latter were. The result has been the evolution of eating places which fabricate food with no technique except the least work, the most speed, and the greatest possible show.

* * * * *

THE new organization will arrange monthly dinners and luncheons, each one of which will feature some regional American dish or a specialty of some foreign country. The Drifter hopes that the first dinner will be one without spinach. He isn't particular what the menu includes just so it excludes a generous portion of this sickly looking, savorless weed. He would, in fact, like to head a committee to inaugurate an "Eat-Less-Spinach Week," or lead a march on Washington to demand a processing tax of $100 a peck and a reduction in acreage devoted to the crop in 1934 of at least 101 per cent. The Drifter can recall a time many years ago when he liked spinach, but that was before he had had it dished up in restaurants after it had been boiled a couple of hours by the cook and then allowed to stand half a day before serving. Even in the days when the Drifter still consented to eat spinach, he remembers it as inferior in flavor to greens of beet or turnip tops, young dandelion leaves, or pig weed, but he thinks what finally set him irretrievably and irrevocably against it was the campaign in its favor by "health experts" and the insistence of his friends that the stuff was "good" for him. The Drifter is in complete accord with the man who was accustomed to say that he owed all his good health to spinach. "Yes," he would add, "I haven't eaten any in ten years."

* * * * *

PROBABLY this insistence that spinach is "good" for one has been a potent influence in making it disliked by most of those now in childhood. Had it been doled out sparingly as a reward for exemplary behavior, it might still

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

be acceptable to the new generation. As it is, the Drifter foresees vengeance when those now in the nursery arrive at an age to go to the polls. An Anti-Spinach Amendment will be offered by Congress and unanimously ratified by the States within a year, which will prohibit the raising, selling, cooking, or serving of spinach anywhere in the United States or its territories. A Volstead Law will be enacted establishing fines and imprisonment for any person serving, providing, or otherwise dispensing a meal containing more than one-half of 1 per cent spinach content, except in prisons as a punishment for crime. Of course some of the older generation will still demand their spinach tipple. The weed will be grown illicitly in moonshine gardens and smuggled into our cities in fast cars or by water in long, low, rakish craft painted gray. There may be spinach chasers and a Spinach Row off Sandy Hook. Certainly there will be spinach speakeasies where Flaming Age will have its fling. Into them will totter bleary-eyed grandfathers and shameless grandmothers with a thirsty shout to the bartender: "George, mix us up a spinach highball quick! And make it old-fashioned style, flavorless, and watery, and weak!"

THE DRIFTER

Correspondence

Pinchot versus Lippmann

TO THE EDITORS OF THE NATION:

If the Roosevelt program fails, it will probably fail because a dogmatic, deductive-minded people fail to adjust to an evolutionary, inductive age. This is nicely illustrated in the criticism of Walter Lippmann by Amos Pinchot in *The Nation* of July 19. Space forbids more than the discussion of one or two paragraphs. The crux of the controversy is whether social and economic life is made of material like the potter's clay to be molded at human will; or whether it is a part of the great biological world and therefore develops from inner urges which produce variations and mutations that selection lays hold of to insure progress.

From the evolutionary point of view Mr. Pinchot is wrong when he writes his dogma that "history repeats itself." History never repeats itself any more than nature produces two individuals just alike. The only way history can be made to repeat itself is for a clever literary writer to take two events much alike and describe them by selecting those phases in which they resemble each other most, thereby ignoring the variations.

From the standpoint of an evolutionist, the three sentences criticized by Mr. Pinchot make very good sense. "Life is [a biological and therefore] an irreversible process. . . . This insight we owe to Bergson [or to some other evolutionist]. The application of it to politics is not difficult [for those who understand the impact of Darwinism], because politics is one of the interests of [human and therefore biological] life." Lippmann's book would have been somewhat voluminous had he put into every sentence the required qualifying phrases necessary to interpret the matter fully to one who does not accept the pragmatic philosophy forced upon us by the wide acceptance of evolutionary and experimental inductive thinking.

"We are homeless in a jungle of machines," means, of course, that we find it very difficult to adjust to our complex age of exact science and modern business and industrial technology. If you grant that there was sufficient cause for the emotion to justify the use of the figure of speech, Lippmann's sentence is better than mine and again much shorter.

Young people in America are fairly familiar with the claim that capitalism as developed under the "philosophy of Alexander Hamilton" is coming to the natural end of an overspecialized biological organism and, like the dinosaurus, is passing to its place among the fossils with feudalism and other outgrown culture patterns. This we heard especially from Norman Thomas and others during the recent Presidential campaign.

Lippmann's straddling in the Sacco-Vanzetti case is a common sin of newspaper writers. They have to be sheep who conform. As Ross says: "The damnable thing about the newspapers is that they will not print the news." Any writer who tries to force them will probably find himself a rebel freak out of a job.

ARTHUR D. CROMWELL

West Chester, Pennsylvania, July 21

Mr. Moley at London

TO THE EDITORS OF THE NATION:

An editorial paragraph in your issue of July 26 says that only the intervention of President Roosevelt saved Raymond Moley from making "an utter fool of himself" at the London conference by attempting a grand-stand play, and adds: "It is reported that he first had the notion of going incognito to London, arriving unannounced at the conference hall. His unexpected appearance would take the delegates by storm and the conference would be saved."

Are you sure of the accuracy of the "report" on which you based your stinging paragraph? Was there no reason to doubt its reliability when it was seen to differ so widely from the known facts regarding Mr. Moley's modest and tactful course in discharging the mission on which he was sent to London by the President? Sharpshooters like Drew Pearson may and do indulge in stupid fabrications at Mr. Moley's expense and it doesn't seem to matter. One expects more fairness from a responsible journal like *The Nation.*

Southbridge, Massachusetts, July 27 V. V. MCNITT

Who Will Send Books?

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

As we begin the second year's work at Highlander Folk School, Monteagle, Tennessee, we find ourselves greatly in need of more books.

This is the only school in the South devoted to the training of native leadership for labor and rural cooperative movements. This year we have furnished leadership in the South's most important mining strike at Wilder, Tennessee; uncovering new facts, furnishing relief, and preventing open warfare. Our students and teachers are giving full-time service to the labor cause in the South, all without salaries. We charge no tuition or other fees. Our living comes from a small farm.

So we must look to interested friends for books. Just now we need the best works on economics, sociology, religion, labor history, and tactics, and the important political and social movements of our day. Also for our community classes and library we need many more books of general literature, from the classics to the latest fiction and juveniles. Books placed in our school will be used constantly and creatively. Reinhold Niebuhr said in a recent editorial: "No worthier cause exists to claim the support of those who believe in labor education."

MYLES HORTON, Director

Monteagle, Tennessee, June 30

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Books and Films

Flight of Fish

By KAY BOYLE

Throughout the tropical and temperate seas flora and fish
Ladies might wear as ornament drift deep in company:
The hermit-crab clasped mouth to mouth with his anemone,
Wax sea-pens floating upright, anchored in the sands,
Or ten-armed squids, clear as glass bugles sounding the dark
forests under sea,
Alight with phosphorescence in their cloaks, and eyes
Like opals given sight to stud the foam.
The flight of squids is brief but powerful,
Wreathed by the boneless arms that weave, weaving in
marriage water with air
Throughout the spasms of their flight; or fish with fins in
motion like an icy fan
Leap in their armor to the saddle of the atmosphere
And before strangling on its gasping flanks, return
To the fresh valleys under water; there lie low
Flickering in ambush until the menace passes, or in fear
Mount the dry steeds again, the parched winds that gallop
Neck to neck, towards shore.

(If flight of fish be fear of enemy
Then how must man and reptile be
Opposed in courage utterly
And no association be.)

There is a time of year, a change of season under water,
A tide of spring and floods, a wide up-rooting
When sea anemones lift their throats and, thirsting, drink
deeply of the wave.
Made buoyant thus they soar above the boughs of coral,
Drifting from windward, like wondrous flowers blowing,
Or ferns with feathered tentacles unfolded by the sea.
Great pliant river fish with metal sides and ventral keels
Embark upon the glassy water in their season,
Carving its surface with the keel's edge sharpened
For strong haunchless leaping from the stream:
Glib ice-eyed fish of Southern continents go winging
In true if unenduring flight for hunting.
(There is a time when the Medusae drift
In languor, opening and closing their parasols.)

Rio Grande

Rio Grande. By Harvey Fergusson. Alfred A. Knopf. $3.

ONE certain morning in the year 1820 or thereabout a coon-skin-capped trapper, pushing farther than his fellows into the forest coverts of the Rockies in search of beavers for the beaver-hat trade, came unexpectedly upon an old and established civilization. He may have had warning that this civilization was there; he may have had none. To the trapper and hunter the Western mountains were his own so far as he could traverse them. Aside from nomadic Indians, he had met no opposition. To stumble upon a highly organized state, with its churches, aristocrats, peasants, and settled customs, must have been a distinct shock to him. It could not be, yet there it was, and he must have reconnoitered carefully.

What he saw was Taos, New Mexico, a farming and ranching community in the valley of the upper Rio Grande. It had not fallen there by accident, but had been left stranded by the now receding tide of Spanish exploration and settlement. It was the farthest reach north of the long arm of Spain on this continent, and as that arm grew powerless and the grasp relaxed in nerveless fingers Taos struck deeper roots into the soil, became as much as necessary sufficient to itself and looked carefully to its weakening defenses.

The trapper, looking out and down, saw the pueblos and corn patches of the Indians along the river, but saw also the white-crossed missions and the great houses of the ricos on the hills. Obviously the place was of no use to a beaver-hunter except as a possible source of supplies. He may have gone away with a faint resentment that his hunting ended at that point. Later, perhaps, he returned with companions to bargain with the Indians or the ricos for food, or to buy a night's lodging under a roof not much more satisfactory to him than the stars. He was a tough fellow, ready with his gun and speaking no Spanish. He would have been doubtfully welcome, if at all. To the ricos he was a vagabond, a man of low caste, a drinker of raw spirits, an alien with no music in his soul. To the Indians he was a swaggering new monster, perhaps a marauder, a vague threat to their peace.

The Indians had learned by long and hard experience to endure the Spaniards, who had come north before the memory of the oldest inhabitants—parties of warriors, delegations of priests, hunting for gold, offering salvation and slaying when resisted, after the fashion of Spanish colonists. They had massacred and been massacred in turn; they had still come on, insatiable, teaching their Christ, enslaving with superior weapons, taking over native customs, inter-breeding, driving out the warlike Comanches, requiring service from the Pueblos by means of an economic machine which the Indians failed to understand but must obey.

Now a new set of explorers had struggled down from the north. At first they came as single spies, but before long there were many of them, and a trail was beaten and blazed between Nebraska and New Mexico. Traders came along that trail with goods to sell in Taos. An annual fair was inaugurated for the exchange of goods. Two arms of conquest had met in the valley, one reaching west and south from the Northeastern seaboard, one reaching north from Mexico and Spain. Yankee traders began to settle in New Mexico, and in Taos itself. A quarrel began for the possession of the country, a quarrel of which the ultimate outcome was never in doubt, for one power was dying, the other just finding its strength. The Yankees set up a government in New Mexico. The Spaniards, in a desperate mood, murdered the governor and some of his entourage. There was a brief war and the Spaniards were beaten.

This story, told brilliantly with a synthesis of little-known facts and in a style peculiarly gracious, is the central theme of Harvey Fergusson's "Rio Grande." He goes back further into origins and takes the tale on into later times, but the essence of this tragic history is in this touching of two civilizations at a vital point in a vital time. The Spaniards who lived on the hills were a race of aristocrats, cultured in their way, proud as hidalgos, and of an undiminished courage. They might have built up a sovereign state, might have extended their influence and ruled an empire. But democracy drifted out that far, represented by a race of hard-bitten, uneducated Natty Bumpos, trampers of the hills, soldiers of meager fortune, and the old order went down as if under a blight. Some of the descendants of the ricos still keep to the old ways, still hold lands and inhabit their adobe castles, but not now so proudly. If they wish a voice in the government they must go to the polls,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

choose who will rule them, help to send Representatives to Congress and Senators to the Senate. Something was lost here that will never be regained. Something is always lost when young barbarians trample the temples and relics of an older race, but since it was our culture that won we cannot bring ourselves to take the matter too much to heart. The lands of the earth, whether we like the code or not, belong to those who can take them.

Mr. Fergusson has written a fascinating book in "Rio Grande," enriched with extraordinary characters, elsewhere untouched, and exciting both to lovers of romance and to students of American history. For original research alone it will stand as a contribution to that history. One reason for its fascination is the perfection of the historical episode which it rehearses. Here, in little, is an epitome of history. An ancient order, laboriously built up on blood and conquest, settles down to a brief period of flower. The rabble of another race overruns it and sets up another system of living. Taos is now the haunt of artists, and the United States, we hope, will sometime achieve a culture comparable to that of Spain in the time of Calderon. But when we reach that point we cannot expect to balance there for ever. It will be time then for the barbarians to look enviously across our borders.

MAXWELL ANDERSON

Jews and Minority Rights

The Jews and Minority Rights (1898-1919). By Oscar I. Janowsky. With a Foreword by Judge Julian W. Mack. Columbia University Press. $3.75.

THE minority peoples of Europe—perhaps thirty millions in all—constitute, as ever, a thorny problem. And if it is allowed to go unsolved, it will remain as great a menace to peace as it proved to be in 1914, when the champion of a discontented minority threw the world into flames. Yet, despite its importance, English works on the problem are few; and Americans can be considered well-informed if they so much as know what a "minority people" means.

Mr. Janowsky's able study is therefore welcome. And because it deals almost exclusively with the Jewish minorities, it is doubly so—for the Jews present, if not a dangerous, at least a widespread, varied, and virulent case of the sufferings undergone by oppressed nationalities, and a case much in the public eye. Moreover, because of their singularly exposed position and, at the same time, of their wide connections in the Allied and victorious nations, the Jews were largely instrumental in securing "minority rights" not only for themselves, but for most of their fellow-victims in Central and Eastern Europe at the close of the war.

The Jewish fight for cultural freedom is told with great care and full detail by the author, who draws upon many unpublished sources from the files of the American Jewish Congress, the American Jewish Committee, the diary of Cyrus Adler, and so on. The views and the efforts of nationalists and anti-nationalists, in Europe and among American Jewry, are presented with calm impartiality. For an imaginative reader, the whole takes on the spirit of a drama.

It is no doubt ungrateful to complain of so painstaking a work; but one misses concrete and telling examples of what the Jews (and others) hoped to preserve or gain by the rights they fought for—of what, in living detail, nationalism and cultural freedom mean to a European minority. But this can be supplied in the story of what has happened to the minorities since the conclusion of the treaties supposedly guaranteeing their rights—a story which we join with Judge Mack in hoping that Mr. Janowsky will soon give us.

MARVIN LOWENTHAL

World Without End

Livingstones. By Derrick Leon. The John Day Company. $2.50.

MR. LEON, to draw his first novel together, has adopted as cunning a device as was Jane Austen's when she deliberately took the occupants of two or three houses and drew upon the complicated interrelationships of their lives. Livingstones is the name of a London firm of interior decorators, and every character in the novel touches somehow the fortunes of the house. The head of the firm is a gentleman who has dared to go into trade, but who cannot resist pretty young girls, even when they are in his own office; his son is an amiable good-for-nothing who occupies himself with the lady customers—after hours; the various employees are variously concerned with the Livingstone family, the customers, and with each other. And the shuttle that weaves back and forth among these people reaches even as far as poor Ernie Telling, whose sister's husband worked for Livingstones, but who, when times got bad and the husband's salary was cut, found the river his only refuge from a life wherein jobs were simply not to be found.

Anyone who has spent several years of his life working with the same group in the same business will recognize the truth of Mr. Leon's portrayal. No partisanship is so fierce as loyalty to one's business associates; no envy can be so bitter as envy of them; no curiosity can be sharper than that which will not quite discover everything about them. The ties which bind the members of a family together hold with obscurer but no stronger links. Indeed, often enough to leave home for the office is in fact to escape from the vague, chafing bonds of the family circle into the warm reality of the life outside, that makes every week-day interesting or actively hateful and leaves Sunday a boring interlude when there is little to do but sleep and eat.

Mr. Leon has understood this very well, and his pattern of relationships is intricately woven and refreshingly realistic. His characters, on the whole, speak with authentic everyday speech, and undergo credible mental processes which lead to equally credible acts. A better than average novel, therefore, which would be better still if Mr. Leon had not been quite so afraid of taking sides, of indulging occasionally in the luxury of emphasis.

One assumes that his aim has been to show that men and women affect other men and women in strange and often unexpected ways. If A had not made such-and-such a decision, then so-and-so would not have happened to B. This, of course, is not a new idea, but it is an effective novelistic device. One need not even quarrel with Mr. Leon's point that because we see here and there a faint pattern in life, we may deduce that an omniscient vision would see the whole pattern and believe it good.

But with all the virtues of his novel, what Mr. Leon needs most is a hero and a denouement. For the first he has wavered among several of his characters, settling at last on none of them; for the second he has allowed himself to be content with his thoughts about the ultimate pattern of life. I am convinced that for these reasons his novel leaves me—although I was pleased with most of the episodes and recognize him as an accomplished writer of fiction—curiously unsatisfied. This, I tell myself, is not really the end. Nothing has happened. With the exception of poor Ernie, drowned in the Thames, all of the members of the firm and their families and acquaintances are left more or less hanging in the air. Realistic enough, perhaps, but art must have its periods. It cannot be put off with a mere semicolon.

DOROTHY VAN DOREN

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Both Ends of the Microscope

Seven Psychologies. By Edna Heidbreder. The Century Company. $3.

The Story of Scientific Psychology. By Adelbert Ford. Sears Publishing Company. $3.

Habits: Their Making and Unmaking. By Knight Dunlap. Liveright. $3.

The Energies of Men. By William McDougall. Charles Scribner's Sons. $2.

General Principles of Human Reflexology. By Vladimir M. Bechterev. International Publishers. $5.

IT was more than forty years ago, as Dr. Heidbreder reminds us, that William James in writing his "Principles" foresaw the "spying and scraping" of his young countrymen robbing psychology of that chivalrous "grand style" with which the British philosophers had endowed it. The first three of these books, all written by American professors, prove how canny his prophecy was.

After a brief review of psychology in its pre-scientific and embryo-scientific stages, Dr. Heidbreder analyzes the seven psychological systems which are, or have been, most influential in America. They are, besides James's theory of the on-flowing consciousness, Titchener's structuralism, the functionalism evolved at the University of Chicago, the dynamic psychology of Columbia, behaviorism, *Gestalt Psychologie,* and the psychoanalytic movement. Despite Dr. Heidbreder's competence, her facility in making the jargon of the laboratory intelligible, and the freshness and pertinency of her incidental criticisms, her book remains curiously boring. A hint as to why it does can be gathered from the very headings of her chapters. Except when she is discussing the imported theories of Freud and the Gestaltists, she connects each of her psychologies with a particular university. This, indeed, is the only way their development could have been comprehensively traced. But that very fact forms a cogent criticism of "scientific" psychology itself. In contrast to all other sciences, the experimental "data" of the psychological laboratories do not become the common property of all other investigators, but remain the jealously guarded, almost secret, possession of the special small group of professors whose theories had foreshadowed them.

Dr. Heidbreder makes a brave effort toward a "justification" of this condition. She maintains that "without the systems few facts would be forthcoming." In this we must admire her courage, but we are more inclined to believe her when she tells us that "the psychologists themselves . . . see with the eyes of familiar association not only the undeniable poverty of their science, but the flimsiness and shoddiness of much of the material they are asked to accept as genuine fact."

If our academic psychology is from its very nature torpid, it can scarcely be brought to stirring life by Dr. Ford's deliberate injections of professorial pep. "The Story of Scientific Psychology" turns out to be hardly a story at all and, if we accept as criteria recurrent inconsistencies and the wilful misuse of such fundamental terms as "cause" and "teleological," only questionably scientific. The whole "narrative account of a very important science," from the time of Plato until today, is rammed into a single chapter of thirty-five pages, which bears the strange heading "The Age of Alchemy." After this the volume falls into the familiar pattern of the regulation textbook, with its standardized discussions of sensation, action, learning, etc., tricked out in appropriately cute terminology.

"Habits," from its title, its preface, and the specific directions it gives for curing stammering, finger-nail biting, and homosexuality, may be no more than a popular guide to practical living. Toward this end the book is startling enough in its assertions that the best way to remember is "to dismiss at once the attempt to remember," and the most effective aid to forgetting is "the deliberate repetition of the motor performance which is to be disintegrated or unlearned." But when we find Dr. Dunlap declaring that "habits, in their totality, make up the character of the individual," we know we are here dealing with his entire concept of psychology. For him even the crying and sucking of a new-born babe are habits, acquired, if you please, *"in utero."* Thus all life, from conception till death, becomes nothing but a process of "learning and unlearning," which is most adequately understood through observing rats run mazes and college students throw darts.

"The Energies of Men" is not a new work but a condensation of Dr. McDougall's earlier "Outline of Psychology" and "Outline of Abnormal Psychology" into one small volume, which affords "the answer to the great question—'What is man that Thou art mindful of him?'" Its only striking innovations are the emphasis this once prudish author now places on sexual perversion and the "concession" he makes to his critics in calling instincts, of which he now recognizes eighteen, by "the good old word 'propensities.'" In spite of these concessions, and even though he never subscribed to the associationism of his native Britain, McDougall remains the last of those philosophic psychologists whose passing James so sincerely regretted.

Bechterev's book persuades us, however, that given the right man in the right country, a grand style can be evolved even from spying and scraping. "Human Reflexology" has become "the dominant note in Russian psychology today," because back in the eighty's its author scraped and spied, not figuratively, but literally into the cerebral cortex of a dog. Though he taught in Russia from then until his death in 1927, it was not until the realization of the October Revolution that Bechterev came into his own. Then the Institute for the Study of the Brain, which he had founded in 1907 and which the tzarists had vigorously persecuted, was merged with the University of Petrograd and became the "GIMZ"—State Institute of Medical Science. Subsequently Bechterev established more than a dozen similar institutes, each one committed to applying "reflexological principles" to a specific problem of the Soviet state, ranging from the taming of anti-social children to the curing of alcoholism.

The appearance in English of the "General Principles" is, as the translators suggest, of special interest to Americans because, like behaviorism, reflexology rejects introspection from the methods of natural science, and studies humanity, individually and collectively, by completely objective methods. But this striking similarity must not be taken as identity. Reflexology is more than the rewriting of the old subjective psychology. It is "a new doctrine," which assumes a "bio-social standpoint" and "draws its general premises from the final generalizations of natural science." Accordingly, Bechterev cuts through the whole mind-body problem by reducing all psychic activity, however recorded, to the "molecular energy" of theoretical physics.

Because of its "premises" reflexology must be judged by the standards not of psychology but of general science. And in this connection it should be noted that the negative results given by recent American experiments on cerebral localization make Bechterev's neurological diagrams of such "orientation reflexes" as speaking and reading appear almost as antiquated as, and very like, phrenological charts. Yet because Bechterev has become "the guiding light in humanistic science in U.S.S.R.," because his reflexology is avowedly a "doctrine" and as such must serve the Soviets not only as psychology but as philosophy as well, it must also be judged by standards broader than those of pure science. Regarded in this light, Bechterev's accomplishment does become rather stupendous. He has provided the Russians with a concept of humanity which, whether or not it agrees with every recent detail of Western science, is com-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pletely deterministic. His doctrine rejects traditional metaphysics knowingly and positively and yet is broad enough to include such diverse hypotheses as Lamarckian evolution, Helmholtz's conservation of energy, Einstein's relativity, and Freud's unconscious. It encompasses the whole of Marx's economic history and yet, because Bechterev recognizes urges other than economic, provides for the highest "creative activities"—art and science.

GRACE ADAMS

Down Under

The Cambridge History of the British Empire. Volume VII: Part I: *Australia.* Part II: *New Zealand.* General Editors: J. H. Rose, A. P. Newton, and E. A. Benians. Adviser for Australia, Ernest Scott. For New Zealand, J. Hight. By various hands. The Macmillan Company. $10.50.

THE authority which will automatically attach itself to these imposing volumes makes them of high importance even though, in an absolute sense, they lack any visible originality in interpretation and little literary brilliance in the statement of the facts assembled with such commendable diligence. As reference works they have no superiors or, for that matter, equals. The bibliographies attached are, while not exhaustive by intent, extraordinarily valuable; they are the best guides to the sources of Australian and New Zealand history available anywhere.

The very inclusiveness of the volumes makes it possible for students of whatever bias to use them advantageously. The facts are assembled, and the present writers have nothing to offer by way of interpretation beyond the conventional and entirely empirical categories of "good" and "bad," but students with a more sharply defined set of values can place an illuminating interpretation on the story with a minimum of effort. What sticks out with quite unusual plainness is the material for a consistently economic interpretation of Australian and New Zealand development. There is a minimum of complicating and obfuscating rationalizations; the pattern does not become at all complex until the latter part of the last century, when the interests of the different groups in the population began to conflict, and compromise and accommodation became common. To this day the Australians and New Zealanders are poor hands at rationalizing their conduct, and it is no trick at all to trace to its British roots what they do have to say in extenuation or justification of their social activity. The inner logic of the inherited structures of thought like the law has been very successfully accommodated to the economic necessities of the two nations, and only an occasional conflict is visible. The chief confusion is one which could be predicted by any perceptive student of human affairs in the present era: the Australian and New Zealand publics have a poor conception of the consequences of supporting capitalism, and they are prone to object to capitalistic logic in public affairs. The result is that they are occasionally (as during the present depression) hard put to it to maintain the imposing structure of governmental solicitude for the masses without attacking the strongholds of the capitalist masters—particularly the masters of money. For it should never be forgotten that what we have in Australia and New Zealand is a highly modified version of nineteenth-century English capitalism with an unusually potent agrarian base, and not in any sense socialism.

Selection of particular authors for special praise would be unnecessarily invidious; the chapters are of an unusual uniformity of excellence; and a comprehensive tribute is best. Certain points, however, seem to call for a special mention. First, both Australia and New Zealand were settled accidentally, so to speak. Australia for many years was regarded solely as a prison colony, and there was an extended fight for freedom; New Zealand, the most British of British colonies, got settled in spite of the reluctance of the Colonial Office to ratify and assist the colonists' efforts. The settlement of both nations was complicated by theoretical paternalism, public and private, which took many guises but all of which worked out to a heavy emphasis on the part of the government in social enterprise. There was thus implanted a tradition of governmental control which has continued to the present day, and which has been utilized by all parties, conservative and radical, to preserve and extend their influence. Both nations, again, were given extraordinary stimulation through the discovery of gold in their dominions. Both were able to profit by the export of capital during the heyday of British capitalism, and so became deeply involved in the fortunes of the mother country. Both have experienced periods of tremendous boom and corresponding periods of depression in response not so much to the nature of their internal activities as in response to the world economy in which they were intimately involved. Both today are almost entirely at the mercy of the world market for primary products. Both have, turning to the future, vast possibilities for expansion, but whether expansion can be made without some readjustment of their economies in the direction of less stimulation from without seems to me doubtful.

My emphasis has been random. Material for the study of Australia and New Zealand is so plentifully supplied in these volumes that the temptation is to develop an extended rationale of their development and probable futures. Perhaps this is as good a sign of their usefulness as any I could indicate.

C. HARTLEY GRATTAN

Health Can Be Bought

Health and Environment. By Edgar Sydenstricker. McGraw-Hill Book Company. $2.50.

THE sick person invariably asks his physician, either complainingly or inquisitively: "Why has this illness come to *me?*" The answer to this question is the problem of Mr. Sydenstricker's book. Health, as a biological characteristic of the human being, is the resultant of two forces, heredity and environment. This fundamental conception, ignored alike by extreme eugenicists and environmentalists, is clearly recognized by Mr. Sydenstricker. To determine for each disease the relative value of these two forces is one of medicine's major problems, to which this monograph is a contribution of great importance.

The book was prepared under the direction of Herbert Hoover's Research Committee on Social Trends. In the Foreword by the committee it is emphasized that the effort was made to keep the investigation as free as possible of "emotional coloring and unverifiable conjectures." This aim Mr. Sydenstricker has eminently achieved in his valuable work.

The author, who is chief statistician of the United States Public Health Service, presents a statistical study based on data from numerous sources, including government reports, life-insurance tables, and technical theses. He points out the limitations of the methods but at the same time rightfully emphasizes the validity of the data. Environmental factors are arbitrarily taken up as follows: geographic; urban and rural; economic and social status; and occupational.

There emerges first a group of diseases which clearly are the result of environmental factors, for example, simple goiter following insufficient iodine intake in food. At the other extreme are the "hereditary" diseases such as family bleeding or hemophilia, made famous by the former ruling families of Spain

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and Russia. Most impressive are the data regarding economic and social status. There is a striking inverse relation between the amount of income and the incidence of sickness and death. Infant mortality, where the father has no earnings, is 217.8 per 1,000; where earnings are $1250 or more per year it is 49.2 per 1,000. Deaths from tuberculosis follow the same direction as factors indicating poverty. Good health apparently has its price, out of the reach of a great mass of our people.

The average age at death has been postponed many years in the last century, due mostly to the decrease of mortality in childhood and early adult life. This has raised the question whether the effect is not that of allowing the survival of weaker individuals and thus lowering the vitality of the American people. Mr. Sydenstricker analyzes this problem with great care, and concludes that there is no convincing evidence of such a trend toward lowered vitality.

There has been a remarkable decrease in recent decades in the mortality from such diseases as typhoid fever, malaria, diphtheria, tuberculosis, and the diarrheas of infancy, the old dreaded summer complaint. This has been due to the change in such environmental factors as sewage disposal, mass immunizations, increased knowledge of the biology of etiological parasites, allowing means for their extermination, and also to a less definable but equally important group of factors that come under the head of improved living conditions. Mr. Sydenstricker has restricted himself to the objective presentation of the data, but it would be interesting to know what forces effected these changes, to find out especially how far labor conditions would have been improved without the militant efforts of unionism. The lives of many philanthropists who endow hospitals and medical institutes appear strangely paradoxical when their activities in labor controversies are viewed. The miner in a tuberculosis sanitorium supported by his employer might still be in good health if his earnings had been adequate for his fundamental needs. The funds for this study were supplied by the Rockefeller Foundation, a fact that is, at the least, ironical, if we recall the labor policy of the Standard Oil interests.

DAVID BERES

Counter-Revolution in Russia

The White Armies of Russia. By George Stewart. The Macmillan Company. $4.

COUNTER-REVOLUTION in any country is apt at first to take the form of blind and senseless military aggression. As Malaparte has indicated, no modern state is prepared either temperamentally or physically to overcome a successful insurrection—except by resort to police or military methods and mass slaughter. In Germany the revolutionists came to terms with the counter-revolutionists. Noske hired officers of the old imperial army to help protect the new republic. Thus Germany was spared some of the bloodiest and most extreme features of civil war—if we overlook such events as the "incidental" shooting of fifteen thousand workers by Noske's reactionary troops—but at the same time the German rebels were sealing their own eventual doom. In Russia the revolutionists elected instead to fight the reactionaries, and not only to fight them but to destroy them if that were possible. For the Bolsheviks saw that so long as a counter-revolutionary force of any size remained in being, the revolution and their own lives would be in constant danger.

The Bolsheviks, moreover, had captured all the essential lines of communication in the country as well as the state machinery. This they had done not by military attack but by insurrection. There were only two ways to overthrow them—by invasion undertaken on a gigantic scale by a foreign army supplied from abroad, or by counter-insurrection. It was impossible for the white armies to defeat the Bolsheviks by purely military measures without adequate outside help. A military campaign based almost entirely on the scanty sources of supply and inadequate lines of communication available to the whites was bound to fail. The author, apparently a military man himself, seems to have understood this, but the white leaders quite obviously did not. Had they spent as much energy in preparing a counter-insurrection in Moscow and Petrograd as they did in trying to recruit armies in the Don, Kuban, Murmansk, and other regions not yet under Bolshevik control, the subsequent history of Russia might have been different. Some of the white leaders realized that they could not win without help from the Allies, but the latter intervened solely with a view to aggrandizing themselves and then only sparingly. The help they actually extended to the white armies was just sufficient to lead some of the reactionary generals into reckless, futile campaigns that cost hundreds of thousands of lives.

The author reviews, from the standpoint of military tactics, the campaigns of Denikin in South Russia, Miller and his associates in the Archangel region, Yudenich in the Baltic country, Kolchak and his murderous subordinates in Siberia, and Wrangel in South Russia (after the retreat of Denikin). He necessarily gives some space to the Allied intervention and the attitude of the Allied countries. But he deals only briefly with the political aspects of the counter-revolution. As a military study his work is commendable. As "a chronicle of counter-revolution" it falls far short of the mark, for while it depicts the weaknesses of the white armies, it fails to analyze or to explain the strength of the numerically small Bolshevik Party which managed not only to resist the military onslaught of the numerically superior whites but ultimately to defeat and demolish them.

MAURITZ A. HALLGREN

The Frontier of Today

The Land of Feast and Famine. By Helge Ingstad. Translated from the Norwegian by Eugene Gay-Tifft. Alfred A. Knopf. $3.50.

THE frontier has not yet vanished from modern life, but it demands hardihood to venture into the frozen Barren Lands. For a thousand miles they stretch across the interior of Canada, and over them roam probably five million Barren Ground caribou and a handful of Indians and trappers. Helge Ingstad had just begun the practice of law in Norway when he exchanged it for four years' solitary adventure in this northern wilderness. His experiences he has put down chronologically in a straightforward account which is neither propaganda for pioneer adventure nor execration of its hardships. It was a life like any other, and the author sets it down as such.

There were months when he and a companion followed an uncharted course up rapids and over portages, burdened by their outfit and harassed by mosquitoes, without being able to win through to the Barren Lands. There were weeks when he accompanied a band of Indian hunters on the trail of the caribou and found none, when, starving and frozen, they pressed on hopelessly with no sight of game. Always in winter there were frozen noses and frost-bitten feet and fingers, and worst of all in summer the clouds of mosquitoes. They were a black mask on one's face while one's hands were busy with the paddle or the pack or managing the unruly dogs. One blew a scum of them off one's tea before one could tip the cup.

But it was a good life. The winter the young Norwegian spent alone with his dog team in the midst of game of every sort, sharing his little sheltered hollow in peace with caribou, ptarmigan, polar hares, and squirrels, was a season to remem-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ber. The most vividly described moments in the book always have to do with the dogs. Young Ingstad is not a very observant person, and his accounts of life with the Indian tribe of Caribou Eaters or of his association with the trappers of the Barrens are lifeless and without detail, but in his pages the dogs are living beings. The success of a winter in the Barren Lands depends upon a hunter's dog team, and he must know every twist of their behavior. But the relationship between them is more than this necessary cooperation. In a snow-bound winter when one never comes across the track of another human being, the dogs are comrades and friends. When food is gone it is the dogs one must think of. When one is prostrated by illness, one must crawl out at all costs to feed the dogs. And when night comes after a successful day, it is still the dogs who make a home of the solitary cabin. They are individuals all of whose idiocyncracies are known and loved.

RUTH BENEDICT

Shorter Notices

When Adam Wept. By A. R. Craig. Doubleday, Doran and Company. $2.

Starting out to write a problem novel—the study of a marriage in which the male partner plays an inferior role economically—Miss Craig strays from her original purpose midway in the narrative, and continues with a study of clashing temperaments, pure and simple. In proportion as she abandons the artificial padding of a thesis, and clarifies the conflict between Peter and Clair as a conflict of temperament, her writing gains in power and insight; and in detailing the final solution of their marriage, she is unrelentingly loyal to the logic of character. Miss Craig writes with unusual skilfulness. In a day when so many first novels appear with such a precocious and dreary "expertness" about them that one wonders if an astral Sears-Roebuck is not purveying standardized parts to young writers, the work of this young Englishwoman stands out for its insight and superior craftsmanship.

Monsoon. By Wilfrid David. Harper and Brothers. $2.

Wilfrid David has written in the form of fiction a stinging indictment of the Englishman's rule in India. His book is youthful, uneven, sometimes naively melodramatic, but impressive in its passionate arraignment of complacency, cruelty, and exploitation. The protagonist, Dorian Fence, goes to school in Paris and then to Cambridge; he drinks, gambles, graduates; refuses to fall in line with his family's die-hard traditions; turns to debauchery for a time, and when that fails him goes to India as a journalist. At this point the book widens enormously. We meet imperialists who become rhetorical about the white man's burden while they sell the Indians "Yuvo" pills for "Frail Nerves and Vitiated Manhood"; Indian liberals, national congressists, Marxists, and the millions of nameless Gandhi followers. As a picture of modern India Mr. David's novel is very successful. There are in it no "holy men," no tales of primitive midwifery, no descriptions of obscene temples, and no sexual aberration. Instead it gives us an impressive and vivid portrayal of the deeper social forces at work in India today.

Thomas Eakins. By Lloyd Goodrich. Published for the Whitney Museum of American Art by the Studio Publications. $10.

Here is a faithfully documented, luxuriously illustrated "critical biography" containing all one may wish to know about the Courbet of American art: his training under Gérome and Bonnat; his travels in Italy, France, and Spain; his interest in higher mathematics, anatomy, perspective, motion photography (Eakins is said to have invented the "zoetrope," one of the first motion-picture cameras), and the relation of these activities to his painting; his break with the Pennsylvania Acadamy over the use of nude models of both sexes in his art classes; his association with the Art Students' League; and a concluding chapter which examines the aesthetic and structural content of Eakins's work. Lloyd Goodrich wisely argues that Eakins's "concern was less with beauty than with the truth of life around him." It is only within the last couple of years that Eakins's realistically painted plein-air landscapes and his more numerous single and group character portraits have begun to be appreciated widely. Unfortunately, at least part of this recent enthusiasm for his work can be traced to an indiscriminate chauvinism for things American, the result perhaps of our economic nationalism. It is to be hoped that this book will secure a place for Eakins's paintings that is neither more nor less exalted than they deserve.

The German Jew: His Share in Modern Culture. By Abraham Myerson and Isaac Goldberg. Alfred A. Knopf. $1.25.

In the last century the Jews of Germany had the effrontery to play a larger part in the cultural life of Germany than their numerical proportion could justify. It is this perhaps that set the self-appreciative Nazis so much against them. In this book the careful presentation of the Jewish contribution to German culture is so persuasive that it may lead some of its readers to the conclusion that the Jews are a superior race. The presence of so many Jewish names in the honor rolls of science, industry, and the arts has, however, satisfactory social and economic explanations which do not need the help of a hypothesis of race superiority.

Local Government in the United States. By Murray Seasongood. Harvard University Press. $1.50.

These Godkin Lectures by the former mayor of Cincinnati constitute a declaration of faith in the possibilities of municipal democracy by one of America's most successful civic leaders. There is a quaint charm and humor in them together with an abundant practical wisdom. Mr. Seasongood states the case for trained minds and remodeled machinery in America's local governments. Discussing the obstacles to efficient administration in boss-ridden cities, the author outlines the reforms in city and county government—the city-manager plan, proportional representation, economy measures—which changed Cincinnati from one of the worst to one of the best governed of our cities. He shows some insight into the economic sources of city misgovernment, but not enough; for the most part the book is written from the point of view of the "best citizens," a phrase which expresses both the strength and weakness of American civic reform.

DON'T COMMIT SUICIDE!
FIND OUT WHAT'S WRONG WITH YOU
A staff of eminent psychologists is at your disposal for advice, information, aid, in The
MODERN PSYCHOLOGIST
Edited by DAGOBERT D. RUNES
From Current Issues
Men Without Women.....*Frank Stevens*
The Superiority Complex.....*A. A. Roback*
Fears and Their Elimination.....*Smiley Blanton*
Can the Homosexual Be Helped?.....*Paul Donald*
How to Adjust Your Personality.....*Alfred Adler*
25c at better newsstands. Send 25c for sample copy or $1.00 for five-month subscription to The Modern Psychologist, 310 Riverside Drive, New York City.
Name .....Na
Address .....

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Films

American Exhibit

IT is not often that one encounters a Hollywood film that can give one the feeling that here, despite certain minor slips and infidelities, is an honest attempt to interpret something fundamental in the American life or character. A test to which more Hollywood pictures might be submitted is the following: Is there in the film just made something so essentially, so unmistakably American that it might be sent abroad as truly representative of what we are and what we think as a nation? According to such a test, "Little Giant," "Call Her Savage," and the Farrell-Gaynor idylls might be found, each in its way, to offer too special or superficial or romanticized a version of what we are as a nation really like. A very little reflection would prove that there are actually few pictures which could pass such a test. It is a memorable week, therefore, in which the local cinema palaces throw up two such distinguished candidates for the American exhibit at the international cinema fair as "Stranger's Return" (Capitol) and "Mama Loves Papa" (Paramount).

Directed by King Vidor, the screen version of Phil Stong's second novel is a much more successful treatment of Middle Western farm life than the same author's "State Fair" viewed earlier in the season. The comparison is made because "State Fair" was, for cinema purposes at least, the better book, and because the superiority of "Stranger's Return" illustrates once again the difference that direction and acting can make in dealing with almost identical material. In the first place, Vidor is one of the most imaginative of Hollywood directors—imaginative in the sense of knowing how to relate the particular situation to the general background. His "The Crowd" remains, in this respect, one of the best of the silent pictures. The task involves a nice equipoise of cinematic appeals, a careful distribution of stress between the characters and the backgrounds to which they are being related. In Russian films, for example, the background is more often than not overdeveloped for the sake of a thesis which places little importance on the individual or his situations. In the average sentimental Hollywood picture, on the other hand, the background is either effaced or totally distorted for the sake of what may be called "character." A good example would be the grotesque Parisian sequence in the current "Pilgrimage." In his attempt to reproduce the quality of life and living on an Iowa farm, Vidor follows what we have hoped will be the new trend in Hollywood productions—an intensive exploitation of specific terrains of American experience. And to this he has added his own special talent of extracting the maximum intensity from the individual situation without losing sight of the frame in which it is placed. If he does not perfectly succeed it is because he has in Lionel Barrymore and Miriam Hopkins extremely histrionic performers who cannot be trusted too long at a stretch. With Beulah Bondi and Franchot Tone the task is less difficult. Lionel Barrymore, provided with a long beard and a stoop, gives a rather too theatrical glow to his patriarchal Iowa farmer who drives out the grasping heirs by simulating madness. But he is properly effective for that reason in those scenes in which he is required to exaggerate—the feigned rages and the abusive interviews with Franchot Tone, with whose flat restraint he is set in contrast. To Miriam Hopkins is assigned the burden of the theme, which is sophisticated urban disillusionment finding solace and release in the purer air of the barnyard. While it is true that Miss Hopkins has neither the glamor nor the fatigue that is demanded in her role she brings to it her own quality, which is exotic enough for the purpose. Whatever one feels about the theme of Mr. Stong's story, which has reminded some people of that of "Turn to the Right," one must be glad of the opportunities it gives a director like Vidor to turn the camera on authentic native material.

From the farmyard to the suburban bungalow is a sharp enough transition, but the second is quite as American as the first, and despite its atrocious title, "Mama Loves Papa" is one of the best screen satires of American life that has yet been ventured. It is as American as the Sunday comic strip, and its hero seems like a composite of Caspar Milquetoast, Rea Irvin's Smythe, and the anonymous Mr. of "Mr. and Mrs." As played by Charles Ruggles with all the detailed perception of a trained stage comedian, the small clerk living contentedly in the suburbs under the thrall of his devoted wife (Mary Boland), enduring the insults of his temperamental employer, and expressing himself only by occasional bad puns, is a vivid incarnation of Mr. Roosevelt's "forgotten man." Nunnally Johnson and Arthur Kober have concocted a hilarious and ingenious scenario to illustrate the encroachments on such a type of the American ideal of success, imposed by the wife who listens to the women's club lecturer, and of civic and business corruption, as represented by the playground-equipment manufacturer who tries to make him his stool-pigeon. Incidental satirical elements are plentiful, and, with the exception of a monument unveiling out of "City Lights," freshly handled. Norman Macleod, the director, does his finest work to date and proves himself among the best of the Hollywood directors who have recently turned to satire.

Although "Midnight Club," which is another Oppenheim society-mystery routine, has an English setting, it manages to capture a little American atmosphere in the person of George Raft, who plays the role of a New York policeman who comes to London to clean up a band of thieves. The picture will offer little reward for anyone not already committed to Mr. Raft's charms. Despite good photography in places and some fair direction at the beginning, it fails to be very effective even in its own genre.

WILLIAM TROY

Contributors to This Issue

DANIEL ALLEN is a student of labor questions and has done special research on conditions in the steel industry.

HAROLD SEIDMAN is a staff writer for *The Nation*.

PAUL Y. ANDERSON is a Washington correspondent for the St. Louis *Post-Dispatch*.

EUNICE LANGDON is the pseudonym of a former schoolteacher.

KAY BOYLE is the author of "The First Lover and Other Stories" and "Year Before Last."

MAXWELL ANDERSON, author of "Night Over Taos," received the Pulitzer prize for his play, "Both Your Houses."

MARVIN LOWENTHAL, a lecturer on the contemporary European scene in the extension department of New York University, is the author of "A World Passed By."

GRACE ADAMS is the author of "Psychology: Science or Superstition."

C. HARTLEY GRATTAN lived for some time in Australia and is the author of "Australian Literature."

DAVID BERES is a practicing physician in New York.

RUTH BENEDICT is in the department of anthropology at Columbia University.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED